DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 106 PS 021 181

AUTHOR	Brush, Lorelei; And Others
TITLE	Bilingual Beginnings: An Evaluation of the Title VII Special Populations Preschool Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Pelavin Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Policy and Planning (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ED/OPP92-16
PUB DATE	93
CONTRACT	LC-300-87-0102
NOTE	331p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Enrollment; Financial Support; Gifted; Language Acquisition; *Limited English Speaking; *Money Management; National Surveys; Parent Participation; Preschool Children; *Preschool Education; Preschool Teachers; Program Descriptions; Special Education; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Linkage; Program Characteristics; *Staff Characteristics

ABSTRACT

In fiscal year 1990, the Bilingual Education Special Populations Program of the Department of Education awarded grants to 30 programs serving children of limited English proficiency. These programs were preschool projects, special education projects, or projects that served gifted children. This document reports the results of a survey, conducted by means of site visits and telephone interviews, of 15 of these programs. Chapter 1 describes the issues examined in the survey and explains the data collection process. Chapter 2 reports the survey results relating to six areas: (1) project goals, including goals for children's language development, cognitive skills, and school readiness, and for parents and staff; (2) project operation and services, including recruitment, enrollment, group size, retention, instructional methods, language usage, materials and equipment, noninstructional services, and parent involvement; (3) project linkages with educational institutions and the community; (4) project staff, including staffing patterns, child-staff ratio, and instructor characteristics and training; (5) participant evaluation, including evaluation of the progress of participating children, children's language development, and analysis of kindergarten enrollment; and (6) fiscal operations. Chapter 3 discusses the implications for policymakers and program managers of survey results that relate to project operations, services, and fiscal operations. Appendixes include tables of data for preschool projects not reported in the document and detailed profiles of the 15 projects surveyed. (BC)

ED354106

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: PS

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. FL

BILINGUAL BEGINNINGS:
AN EVALUATION OF THE TITLE VII SPECIAL POPULATIONS PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

Prepared under contract for
the U.S. Department of Education,
Office of Policy and Planning

Pelavin Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C.
Contract No. LC 300-87-0102

PS 021181

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF POLICY AND PLANNING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BILINGUAL BEGINNINGS:
AN EVALUATION OF THE TITLE VII SPECIAL POPULATIONS PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

1993

Lorelei Brush
Renee Sherman
Rebecca Herman
Lenore Webb

Prepared for:

Office of Policy and Planning
U.S. Department of Education

By Pelavin Associates, Inc.

The report was prepared pursuant to Contract No. LC 300-87-0102, Task Order No. LB 88-0502 (David Moguel, Project Officer), U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Following the enactment in 1984 of the Bilingual Education Special Populations Program, the Department of Education (ED) began providing assistance to preschool, special education, and gifted and talented projects serving limited English proficient (LEP) children. In the fall of 1990, Pelavin Associates, Inc. was asked to describe the characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of the preschool projects funded by this Program in Fiscal Year 1990 (FY 90). The examination of these preschool projects is particularly appropriate at this time because President Bush and the nation's governors have set a goal for the year 2000 that all children enter school ready to learn. Preschool programs for LEP children forward this goal. In addition, ED is concerned with issues of coordinating preschool services across federal programs. Understanding the workings of these bilingual preschool programs will help advance their ability to coordinate services.

In FY 90 the Program awarded 30 grants--12 for new projects, nine for projects continuing for their second year, and nine for projects entering their third and final year of operation under the Program. The combination of research activities conducted to obtain data for this review varied according to the number of years the project had been funded. For all projects in their first year of operation and the two second-year projects outside the continental United States we conducted a file review. For the other second-year projects and two third-year projects, we conducted a file review and a site visit.[1] For the other third-year projects, we conducted a file review and a telephone interview.

The findings that follow concern the 15 projects that received site visits or telephone interviews: these are the projects whose program information was verified by outside staff.

---

[1] One of these sites asked that its data not be included in the report.

Specific questions involve six areas: project goals and program philosophy; project operation and services; project staff; educational and community linkages; participant evaluation; and fiscal operations.

Findings

Program Philosophy, Project Operation and Services

The 15 projects represent a diversity in the philosophies of bilingual education espoused and the ways in which the bilingual philosophy was incorporated into classroom procedures. Some projects emphasized learning English, some the native language, and the others placed equal emphasis on the two languages. Some enrolled only LEP children; others operated based on the notion that LEP children learn English more quickly when they play with children who speak only English. Some projects introduced languages into the classroom by providing instruction predominantly in the child's native language; some provided instruction predominantly in English; one used an English-to-speakers-of-other-languages approach; and one used alternate Spanish and English models--one classroom teacher spoke only Spanish and the other only English. Some worked exclusively with members of low-income families; others enrolled a range of socio-economic groups. Some worked exclusively with preschool children; others continued the program into kindergarten.

In addition to the diversity in approach to bilingual education, there is a difference in the degree to which projects were developmentally appropriate for preschool children. Those that were less appropriate offered predominantly teacher-directed activities and focused on cognitive and language skills. Those that were more appropriate allowed children to direct their own learning and progress at their own pace; the programs were concerned with the development of the "whole child", rather than only the child's intellectual/language skills.

Some services were common across projects. Every project had an active parent component in that each sponsored parent meetings and training sessions; some went further. All of the projects offered services for children above and beyond classroom activities (e.g., transportation, meals and snacks, and/or access to the housing school's nurse or health services). Families were sometimes offered counseling and social service referrals.

Project Staff

Staffing patterns, too, were similar across grantees. Every project was staffed by an administrator and a combination of teachers and aides; some added specialists. In most instances, the ethnicity of the staff matched that of the children and some, if not all, of the staff spoke the language of the children. Each project offered in-service training for staff; some also had preservice training or enrolled staff in programs leading to a credential.

Educational and Community Linkages

All projects had linkages within their communities. Projects under the auspices of a school system were inextricably connected to that system; projects under the auspices of a community agency were well linked to other community services.

Participant Evaluation

Projects also shared common outcomes for children. Participants in each project were observed to gain some skill in English. Many began the year with no knowledge of English and gained rudimentary skill. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 and 2 representing "non-English speaker" and 3 "limited English speaker," projects' average scores at the end of the year ranged from 1.8 to 3.1. However, interpretation of these test scores may be problematic at best.

Kindergarten and first-grade teachers reported project participants to be ahead of children who had not attended preschool in the wide range of cognitive, social/emotional, and motor skills needed by elementary school students. No testing of these skills was done; and no true control groups were used.

Fiscal Operations

The total dollar amount granted to the projects ranged from $57,919 to $304,421. The cost of the projects per child ranged from $619 to $8,481, depending largely on the services paid for by project funds. Seven projects operated full preschool programs, with the grants funding the gamut of services required by such a program. These were the more expensive projects. Four projects provided supplementary funding to existing preschool programs to expand their bilingual services. Three projects were existing preschool programs that used Special Populations funding to develop curriculums appropriate to their populations of children and families. The final project provided training and technical assistance to several school districts' programs to enhance their knowledge of early childhood education and bilingual programming. These last eight projects were less expensive than those funding the full range of services.

Funding level seemed related to the capacity of a project to continue after the end of the three-year funding cycle. Projects that received full funding from Special Populations Preschool monies seemed less likely to be able to continue than those for whom funding was supplementary.

Implications

The findings in two areas (project operation and services, and fiscal operations) have implications for policy makers and program managers with regard to future directions for the program.

Project Operation and Services

Several findings regarding project operation and services suggest further issues. Three of these findings concern enrollment. First, in some projects there was a relatively low percentage of LEP children enrolled (24 percent in one project). This limited enrollment suggests the following question:

- Should the law require that a minimum percentage of LEP children be served to ensure that the projects are for "limited English proficient" children?

Staff in a number of projects reported difficulties in recruiting LEP children. To ensure that staff have adequate recruitment plans, program managers might address the following issue:

- Should proposals be required to discuss how projects will recruit LEP children and families to ensure that the proposed enrollment figures will be met?

Second, projects funded by this grant program are not required to serve low-income families. In one project only 48 percent of the families served were low-income. This raises the following question:

- Is there an intention in the regulations to give priority to projects with a high percentage of low-income families?

Finally, three of the projects served kindergarten children in addition to preschool-aged children. In each case, project funds supplemented the kindergarten programs and did not pay for such core expenses as the salaries of the teachers. This raises another question:

- Should there be restrictions on the funding of kindergarten programs? Are activities such as developing a kindergarten curriculum; paying for an aide for the kindergarten classroom; or paying for field trips, equipment, and materials for that classroom appropriate?

Additional questions result from the finding that only about half of the projects have developmentally appropriate programs:

- Should proposals be required to include a discussion of the curriculum and approach to be used in the implementation of the program? These could be judged in the area of developmental appropriateness.
- Should staff job descriptions and qualifications be reviewed to ensure that training in early childhood education is present? Should reviewing procedures ensure that in-service training on developmental issues will occur?

A final question in this area stems from the finding that all projects offered a parent component and encouraged increased involvement of parents in the education and development of their children. It may be appropriate to institute a requirement for projects to have such a component:

- Should project design be required to include a parent involvement component, ensuring that the project has realistic plans to involve parents by using them as volunteers in the classroom or on field trips, offering parent training sessions, and/or including parents in ethnic festivals or other cultural awareness activities?

Fiscal Operations

The variation in budgeted cost per child and its potential relationship to future project capacity raise the following questions:

- Could proposal review benefit from setting a ceiling on budgeted cost per child of $5,000 to $5,500, thus encouraging projects to find additional funding (if needed) to operate a full program?
- Should projects that will use Special Populations grant funds to supplement other funding be given preference in the review process because of their greater potential for continuation after the termination of grant funding?

CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1

Study Questions 1
  Project Goals 2
  Project Operation and Services 2
  Project Staff 5
  Educational and Community Linkages 5
  Participant Evaluation 5
  Fiscal Operations 5

The Data Collection Process 6
  File Reviews 8
  Telephone Interviews 8
  Site Visits 9

Organization of the Report 10

CHAPTER II RESULTS 12

Overview 12
Findings in Each Research Area 14
  Project Goals 14
    Children's Language Development 14
    Children's Cognitive and School Readiness Skills 17
    Other Goals for Children 18
    Goals for Parents 19
    Goals for Staff 20
  Project Operation and Services 21
    Community Characteristics 21
    Recruitment 21
    Enrollment 28
    Group Size 34
    Retention 35
    Schedules of Operation 35
    Instructional Methods 39
    Language Usage 43
    Materials and Equipment 48
    Non-Instructional Services 53
    Parent Involvement 55
  Educational and Community Linkages 60

CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

Page

- Educational Linkages 60
- Community Linkages 63
- Project Staff 64
  - Staffing Patterns 64
  - Child/Staff Ratio 68
  - Instructor Characteristics 69
  - Training 70
  - Types of Training Activities 71
- Participant Evaluation 74
  - Participant Progress 74
  - Results Concerning Language Development 88
  - Results Concerning Other Skills 91
  - Kindergarten Enrollment 93
  - Follow-up Evaluations 96
- Fiscal Operations 98
  - 1989-90 Budgets 98
  - Future Project Capacity 101
- Conclusions: Keys to Success; Major Challenges; Recommendations 103
- Keys to Success; Major Challenges; Recommendations 103
  - Keys to Success 104
  - Major Challenges 105
  - Recommendations for Future Projects 106

CHAPTER III IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS 108

- Implications of Results Concerning Project Operation 108
  - Data on the Population Served 108
  - Developmental Appropriateness 110
  - Recommendations for Future Projects 111
    - Staffing 112
    - Parent Involvement 112
    - Recruitment 113
    - Project Budgets 114
  - Implications of Results Concerning Project Outcomes 114
  - The Prognosis for First-Year Projects 117

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF KEY DATA (Special Populations Preschool Projects Not Analyzed in Report)

APPENDIX B
SITE SUMMARIES

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit		Page
I-1	Data Collection Activities	7
II-1	Primary Goal Areas for Children	15
II-2	Goals for Parents and Staff	16
II-3	Participant Characteristics	22
II-4	Recruitment Strategies	25
II-5	Number of Children Enrolled, 1989-90	29
II-6	Percent Low-Income and LEP Participants, 1989-90	30
II-7	Age of Participants Served, 1989-90	32
II-8	Retention Rates, 1989-90	36
II-9	Project Operations	37
II-10	Presence of Appropriate Materials and Equipment, 1989-90	49
II-11	Non-Instructional Services, 1989-90	54
II-12	Parental Involvement in Child-Oriented Activities	57
II-13	Staff Characteristics	65
II-14	Staff Development, 1989-90	72
II-15	Evaluation of Participant Progress	75
II-16	Progress in Language Skills as Measured by Standardized Tests	89
II-17	Kindergarten Enrollment	94
II-18	Follow-Up Assessments	97
II-19	1989-90 Budget Data	99
II-20	Capacity Building	102

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Following the enactment in 1984 of the Bilingual Education Special Populations Program, the Department of Education (ED) began providing assistance to preschool, special education, and gifted and talented projects for limited English proficient (LEP) students. In the fall of 1990, Pelavin Associates, Inc., was asked to describe the characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of a subset of the preschool projects funded by this program in Fiscal Year 1990 (FY 90).[1] This report is a result of that review.

The fall of 1990 is a particularly appropriate time for such a review. President Bush and the nation's governors have set an educational goal for the year 2000 to ensure that all children enter school ready to learn. Preschool programs for LEP children forward this goal by helping these individuals gain a sufficient command of English to succeed in elementary school. In addition, ED is concerned with issues of coordinating preschool services across federal programs. Understanding the workings of each program advances ED's ability to achieve optimal coordination.

Study Questions

The issues researched in this descriptive study may be categorized into six areas:

- Project Goals;
- Project Operation and Services;
- Project Staff;

---

[1] Note that one of the projects reviewed was a preschool project that operated within a special education program. It could be classified as a part of either or both groups of Special Populations projects.

- Educational and Community Linkages;
- Participant Evaluation; and
- Fiscal Operations.

Project Goals

Each of the projects operating under the Special Populations Preschool grants has as its goal facilitating LEP children's transition into the English-speaking environment of elementary school. The philosophy that guides an individual program defines the context in which English is introduced. The basic tenet of the philosophy of most bilingual programs is that the learning of English should occur within an atmosphere of support for the culture and language background of the child.

Beyond this tenet, projects have defined numerous goals and objectives for children, parents, and staff that help define their introduction of English and other project services. For example, some projects stress the general cognitive development of children in addition to their language development. Many adopt the tenet that parents are the most critical educators of their children and should be an integral part of a bilingual preschool program. Some projects believe that the development of staff skills is critical to the continuing success of their endeavor.

In the discussion of project goals and program philosophy, we examine the theoretical framework that underlies each project and the explicit goals stated in project proposals and in interviews with staff. Such a discussion provides an excellent backdrop for the following discussion of project operation.

Project Operation and Services

Within this area of concern are four groups of questions. First, what are the characteristics of the community in which the project is located? The neighborhood may be a traditional enclave of individuals speaking a language other than English or it may be that LEP families represent a small proportion of the neighborhood. The area may be urban, suburban, or rural. Such characteristics provide a backdrop for a discussion of the program itself.

Second, what are the demographics of the population served? This group of questions might include: How many children are served by the project? How many different languages are spoken by those served? What proportion of families are low-income? What proportion of children are considered LEP? Such statistics supply an understanding of the needs of the population to be served.

Third, what services are offered within the project? The answer to this question requires an understanding of the project's hours of operation; the nature of its services (instructional and otherwise); and indices of its quality such as group size, child/staff ratio, and materials and equipment. Of particular importance is its approach to children's learning of languages, both their native language and English.

One key question concerning services is whether the project offers a developmentally appropriate curriculum for children. In assessing this criterion, we follow the definition espoused by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), an organization that accredits child care programs. In general, they subscribe to the notion that "a high quality early childhood program provides a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of families".[2] Such a program has the following features:

- The curriculum uses an integrated approach to provide for all areas of a child's development: physical, emotional, social, and cognitive.

---

[2] Bredekamp, S. (Ed.) Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1987, pg. 1.

- Curriculum planning emphasizes learning as an interactive process wherein teachers shape the environment so that children may learn through active exploration and interaction with adults, other children, and materials.

- Learning materials and activities are concrete, real, and relevant to the lives of young children.

- Teachers provide a variety of activities and materials, increasing the difficulty, complexity, and challenge of an activity as children are involved with it and develop understanding and skills.

- Children have choices among a variety of activities, materials, and equipment, and they have time to explore through active involvement. Adults extend children's engagement by asking questions or making suggestions that stimulate their thinking.

- Multicultural and non-sexist experiences, materials, and equipment are provided.

- Adults provide many varied opportunities for children to communicate through hearing and using language.

- Adults facilitate the development of self-esteem and self-control by respecting, accepting, and comforting children.

- Parents have both the right and the responsibility to share in decisions about their children's care and education and are encouraged to observe and participate in the program.

- Teachers share their knowledge of child development, insights, and resources through regular communication with family members.

- Teachers, parents, and other program staff share developmental information about children as they pass from one level or program to another.

Fourth, how are children recruited for the project and what actions are taken to ensure that they remain to benefit fully from project services? It is certainly of interest to know whether projects try to work with the most disadvantaged children or make particular efforts to recruit and involve these families.

Project Staff

Study questions in this area concern the characteristics of staff, including ethnicity, language(s) spoken, and qualifications; the degree of staff turnover; and the staff development activities available. The National Day Care Study[3] showed that staff training in early childhood education was essential for a high-quality preschool program.

Educational and Community Linkages

For a program to achieve long-term gains for children, it would seem helpful for it to cooperate with the local school system so that graduates of the preschool program proceed directly into a "sister" program at the elementary school. The questions in this area concern the sorts of arrangements that have been made between the preschool and elementary school for continuation of services to children. In addition, how supportive or involved is the community in providing bilingual services for children?

Participant Evaluation

All preschool children change tremendously in the course of a year, developing new skills in cognitive, social/emotional, and motor areas. It is important to know what sorts of growth are fostered by bilingual preschool programs in order to build appropriate expectations for project performance. Most projects test children near the beginning of the school year and again at the end to evaluate their development. A review of such testing programs allows for conclusions to be made about appropriate expectations for preschools.

Fiscal Operations

Questions concerning costs include two sorts of issues: How are monies being spent? What evidence is there that projects can continue to operate after the ending of the federal grant? It is interesting to examine such notions as the cost per child served by the project and the ways projects are structured to build their own capacity to continue without federal funding.

---

[3] Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., and Coelen, C. Children at the Center. Cambridge: Abt Associates, 1979.

The Data Collection Process

The Special Populations Preschool Program awarded 30 grants for FY 90: 12 were awards for new projects, nine were for projects continuing for their second year, and nine were for projects entering their third and final year of operation under the program. The combination of research activities conducted to obtain data for this project varied according to the number of years the project had been funded in its three-year cycle.

Exhibit I-1, Data Collection Activities, shows the different data collection activities for projects in each of the years of the three-year funding cycle. For all projects in their first year of operation, we conducted a file review.[4] For most of the second-year projects, we conducted a file review and a site visit. The exceptions are the projects in American Samoa and Guam, which were too distant to allow for site visits.

For most of the third-year projects, we conducted a file review and a telephone interview. But once again there were exceptions. The projects in Fremont and Irvine,[5] California, were selected for site visits, instead of telephone interviews, because they were continuing operation without Title VII funds in FY 91, and they served mixed language groups of children, a model of bilingual education not well represented in the second-year projects.

---

[4] Key data from the first-year projects and two second-year projects (Pago Pago, AS, and Agana, GU) are summarized in Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 in Appendix A. This information was not verified through interviews or site visits.

[5] The Irvine, CA, project chose not to have its data included in the report.

EXHIBIT I-1

Data Collection Activities

SITE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES			
SITE	FILE REVIEW	SITE VISIT	TELEPHONE INTERVIEW
FIRST-YEAR PROJECTS			
Barrow, AK	X		
Unalakleet, AK	X		
Pasadena, CA	X		
Soledad, CA	X		
Albuquerque, NM	X		
Anthony, NC	X		
El Rito, NM	X		
Stilwell, OK (Bell Elementary)	X		
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)	X		
Stilwell (School District I-25)	X		
Del Rio, TX	X		
Tacoma, WA	X		
SECOND-YEAR PROJECTS			
Pago Pago, AS	X		
Madera, CA	X	X	
Miami, FL	X	X	
Agana, GU	X		
Kansas City, MO	X	X	
Brooklyn, NY	X	X	
Oaks, OK	X	X	
Hidalgo, TX	X	X	
San Antonio, TX	X	X	
THIRD-YEAR PROJECTS			
Kotzebue, AK	X		X
Fillmore, CA	X		X
Fremont, CA	X	X	
St. Paul, MN	X		X
Queens, NY	X		X
Manhattan, NY	X		X
Oklahoma City, OK	X		X
Seattle, WA	X		X

File Reviews

Pelavin Associates' staff reviewed and compiled data from ED project files for each of the 30 preschool grants funded for FY 90 under the Special Populations Preschool Program. Data sources from project files included the grant applications for all of the projects and the performance and evaluation reports prepared for ED for projects that were in their second and third year of operation.

The purpose of the file review was to obtain information on as many of the research questions as possible. Information from the files for each project was collected in two forms. First, we developed tables to present numerical and category data. The available information of this type summarizes data relevant to three of the research areas--participant characteristics, project operation, and staff characteristics. Second, we extracted additional descriptive data by developing written summaries for each topical area, collecting information in all of the six research areas.

Telephone Interviews

Telephone interviews supplemented file reviews for seven of the nine Special Populations Preschool projects originally funded in FY 88 and completing their third and final year of project funding in FY 90. The purpose of the telephone interviews was to obtain more detailed information on projects than was available in the files. The protocol for the interview encompassed all of the areas outlined in the research questions, and had, in addition, questions about the development of the project and the major successes and difficulties staff faced, and a request for suggestions for other projects trying to design the most beneficial bilingual preschool program.

The seven projects were contacted toward the end of September or the beginning of October 1990. Where possible, project directors were interviewed. In instances where the project director had left the agency or school system, the available individual most knowledgeable about the project was interviewed. The interview itself averaged two hours in length, and, in several cases, required multiple telephone calls.

Site Visits

We conducted site visits to nine Special Populations preschool projects. Included in the group were seven projects that were initially funded for FY 89 (second-year projects) and two projects funded first for FY 88 (third-year projects). The site visits had three components: (1) interviews with project personnel and participants; (2) reviews of documents; and (3) classroom observations. Interviews were conducted with individuals involved in project oversight, administration, and service delivery. These included:

- Project director and other administrative staff;
- Service delivery staff such as the project's bilingual coordinator, teachers, and aides;
- Elementary school staff such as the principal and kindergarten teachers of project graduates;
- School district staff such as the bilingual coordinator and the superintendent; and
- Parents.

Materials reviewed during the site visit included the following:

- Statements on project goals and objectives;
- Records on children (to update information on language, age, ethnicity, etc.);
- Any outreach materials created for the recruitment process or to describe the project to the community;
- Instructional materials such as sample lesson plans, copies of curricula, etc.;
- Information on staff characteristics;
- Any evaluation materials, including instruments and results, used to assess participants, instructional methodologies, recruitment strategies, or parent and community involvement; and

- Descriptions of administrative structure.

At each site, Pelavin Associates' staff observed classroom activities during a morning or an afternoon on two consecutive days. These observations had three purposes: to provide a snapshot of materials and equipment in the classroom to determine whether the classroom was organized to meet the goals and objectives of the project; to observe the use of English and the native language(s) of children in the classroom; and to assess whether the setting and activities were developmentally appropriate.

Following each telephone interview and upon return from each site visit, staff prepared a concise summary of the information collected. These summaries are presented in Appendix B.

Organization of the Report

Chapter II contains an integration of the information from site summaries and, therefore, concerns 15 second- and third-year projects. Chapter III first summarizes key results from Chapter II and their implications for policy and program-management decisions. Specifically, it raises questions of the intent of the program with regard to serving a certain percentage of LEP children, low-income families, and children in kindergarten. It then discusses problems in meeting guidelines for developmentally appropriate practice, suggestions of project staff for optimal programming, and the implications of results concerning the outcomes of the project in terms of children's progress and the ability of the project to continue operation after the termination of the Special Populations Preschool grant.

Chapter III also includes a review of first-year projects and the prognosis for their showing successful outcomes. It is important to remember, in reading this section, that the only data available from these projects were applications for first-year funding. They are, therefore, only statements of what applicants intend to do if they receive funding. We do not know how the program in each of these sites has been implemented, even at the level of knowing how many children are being served. In consequence, comments on the projects must be tentative, pending further reporting on the program's implementation and results.

CHAPTER II

RESULTS

Overview

The 15 bilingual preschool projects reviewed represent a wide variety of programs. Seven of them (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Fillmore, CA; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA) operated preschool programs, with the grants funding the gamut of services required by such a program. Four projects (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; St. Paul, MN; and Oklahoma City, OK) provided supplementary funding to preschool programs that already existed. Of these four, the school system in Miami funded a preschool program for special needs children that was supplemented by the Special Populations Preschool grant to add a bilingual component. The other three projects were existing preschool programs funded by independent agencies that used Special Populations Preschool grants to expand their bilingual services. Three other projects (Hidalgo, TX; Kotzebue, AK; and Fremont, CA) were existing preschool programs that used Special Populations funding to develop curricula appropriate to their populations of children and families. The final project (San Antonio, TX) provided training and technical assistance; its staff worked with preschool and kindergarten teachers in four school districts' programs to enhance their knowledge of early childhood education and bilingual programming.

The diversity among grantees also extends to the philosophies of bilingual education espoused and to the ways in which the bilingual philosophy is incorporated into classroom procedures. Some projects emphasized learning English (Miami, FL; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), some the native language (Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; and Fillmore, CA), and the others placed equal emphasis on the two languages. Some enrolled only LEP children (Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA); the others operated based on the notion that LEP children learn English more quickly when they play with children who speak only English. Some projects introduced languages into the classroom by providing instruction predominantly in the child's native language (Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK); some provided instruction predominantly in English (Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; and Seattle, WA); one (Miami, FL), used an English-to-speakers-of-other-languages approach; and one (Madera, CA), used alternate Spanish and English models--one classroom teacher spoke only Spanish and the other only English.

In addition to the diversity in approach to bilingual education, there is a difference in the degree to which projects focus on teacher-directed learning as opposed to a more developmentally appropriate orientation toward child-initiated learning. Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, were observed to have classrooms that could readily be classified as developmentally appropriate. Their classroom organization and daily activities encouraged child-initiated learning. Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; and Fremont, CA, were more limited in their organization of activities in that they seemed to emphasize teacher-directed learning.

Among this diversity, however, were common themes. Every project had an active parent component in that they offered parent meetings and training sessions. All of the projects offered services for children above and beyond the classroom activities. These often included transportation, meals and snacks, or access to the housing school's nurse or health services. Families were sometimes offered counseling and social service referrals. Finally, staff in each project had opportunities for additional training through in-service (and sometimes other) programs.

Projects also shared common outcomes for children. Every project measured the language proficiency of children in English at the beginning and end of the program year. Children in each project were observed to gain some language skill. The kindergarten teachers reported project participants as ahead of children who had not attended preschool in the wide range of cognitive, social/emotional, and motor skills needed by elementary school students.

In the remainder of this chapter we report the results of our telephone interviews and site visits to second- and third-year Special Populations Preschool projects. We begin by discussing the goals stated by these projects, continue with a thorough review of project operation and services, educational and community linkages, staffing, participant evaluation, and fiscal operations. In our conclusion, we describe project staff members' notions of the keys to program success, major challenges, and how future projects should be organized to maximize their chances for success.

Findings in Each Research Area

Project Goals

In their written materials and in interviews, staff expressed project goals in terms of the individuals who would be affected by the project: children, parents, and staff. (See Exhibit II-1, Primary Goal Areas for Children and Exhibit II-2, Goal Areas for Parents and Staff.[6]) In the following sections, we summarize the goals for children in language development, cognitive skills and school readiness, and other areas; we then discuss goals for parents and staff.

Children's Language Development

The first two goal areas, "English language" and "Native language," describe the emphasis of a project on the development of one or both of these languages. Six projects (Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), emphasized

---

[6] Note that project staff were not given a list of goals, but were simply asked to delineate their goals. This means that projects may have goals that are not included on the chart. It also means that projects may have components that appear to suggest a goal (e.g., a strong parent involvement component), but that no goal appears on the table.

EXHIBIT II-1

Primary Goal Areas for Children

Project	English lang.	Native lang.	Cognitive knowldg.	School readiness	Social dev't.	Different cultures	Self-help/ Emotional dev't.	Physical dev't.
Second-Year Projects								
Madera, CA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Miami, FL	X		X	X	X		X	
Kansas City, MO	X	X				X		
Brooklyn, NY		X	X		X	X	X	X
Oaks, OK	X			X	X	X	X	X
Hidalgo, TX	X	X	X	X	X		X	
San Antonio, TX	X	X	X		X			X
Third-Year Projects								
Kotzebue, AK	X				X	X		
Fillmore, CA		X		X	X			
Fremont, CA	X	X		X		X	X	
St. Paul, MN	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Manhattan, NY	X			X	X		X	X
Queens, NY	X			X			X	
Oklahoma City, OK	X		X		X		X	
Seattle, WA	X	X		X	X	X		
TOTALS								
Number	13	9	6	10	12	7	10	6
Percent	86%	60%	40%	67%	80%	47%	67%	40

EXHIBIT II-2

Goals for Parents and Staff

Project	Parents			Staff		
	Involve in child's learning/dev't.	Enhance parenting skills	Improve English lang. skills	Develop curriculum	Receive training	Become certified
Second-Year Projects						
Madera, CA						
Miami, FL	X	X			X	
Kansas City, MO	X				X	
Brooklyn, NY	X	X	X		X	
Oaks, OK		X	X		X	X
Hidalgo, TX	X	X		X	X	
San Antonio, TX	X				X	
Third-Year Projects						
Kotzebue, AK				X	X	X
Fillmore, CA	X	X				
Fremont, CA	X	X	X	X	X	
St. Paul, MN	X					
Manhattan, NY	X	X				
Queens, NY	X		X		X	
Oklahoma City, OK	X				X	X
Seattle, WA	X					
Totals						
Number	12	7	4	3	10	3
Percent	80%	47%	27%	20%	67%	20%

the development of English language skills but not increasing skills in the child's native language. These projects were particularly concerned that children be prepared for elementary school classrooms conducted in English. They were not attempting to ignore or erase the child's language or culture but, rather were concentrating their efforts on the development of skills in the language children will need to use in school.

Two projects emphasized the native language over English for the LEP children: (Brooklyn, NY, and Fillmore, CA). Each of these projects had adopted the philosophy that a child will excel in the learning of concepts if he or she has a solid grounding in the native language. Later learning of English and the transfer of concepts will be relatively easy, they believe, when this foundation in the native language has been laid.

Seven projects stated goals both for the learning of English and the native language (Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; and Seattle, WA). They made explicit their philosophy that children need to learn English, but that this is better done in a bilingual context in which the native language is taught as well as the second language.

Children's Cognitive and School Readiness Skills

Projects were judged as having the development of cognitive knowledge as a goal if they listed the sorts of information that a child should have by the end of the project year. For example, the project in Oklahoma City, OK, had as an explicit goal that all children learn the names of colors and numbers. Projects were considered to have a goal in the school readiness area if they used the term "school readiness" or if they stated a variety of goals relevant to fitting easily into a kindergarten setting (e.g., have the skills needed to benefit as much as possible from kindergarten; know how to sit still, take direction, interact well with others).

Six projects stated explicit goals for cognitive knowledge (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; and Oklahoma City, OK). Each seemed concerned that children have a set of skills that provide a good foundation for later learning of school subjects and that kindergarten teachers have deemed important. In general, this emphasis is more explicitly instructional than one provided by a project that tries to "develop the whole child". The latter approach, considered developmentally appropriate for preschoolers, accepts that children will learn in the course of child-directed activities; the former approach tends to emphasize teacher-directed learning of such skills.

Ten of the projects aimed to have all children "ready" for school (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). These projects were concerned that children understand the school environment, the rules they will encounter in kindergarten, and the expectations for their behavior.

Other Goals for Children

Four goal areas have been differentiated within the general social, emotional, and physical development areas. First, under "social development" have been placed goals for developing children's skills in interacting with other children and adults, both those stated in these global terms and those stated using example behaviors such as sharing or understanding the feelings of others. Twelve projects stated such goals (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA).

Second, the category "different cultures" has been checked for those projects that stated that it was important for children to understand their own culture and other cultures. Seven projects made such statements (Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK;

Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; and Seattle, WA). Kotzebue, AK, for example, wanted to "rededicate children to traditional [cultural] values." Other projects in this group wanted children to "understand and respect" the culture from which they came.

Third, 10 projects discussed the goal of developing children's self-help skills, self-concept, self-esteem, or emotional skills (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK).

Finally, six projects (generally those emphasizing the "whole child") had goals in the area of physical development or the refinement of fine and gross motor skills (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; St. Paul, MN; and Manhattan, NY).

Goals for Parents

Three goal areas for parents were differentiated by projects: involving parents in the child's learning and development; enhancing parenting skills; and improving parents' English language skills. Most projects (see Exhibit II-2) held the first goal, believing that parents are the primary educators of their children and should be involved in all steps of the educational process. In general, these projects offered opportunities for parents to become involved through volunteer work in the classroom or on field trips, through parent training activities, and by providing learning materials that parents and children could work on together at home.

Seven projects wanted to enhance the parenting skills of their children's parents. Generally, this meant that they offered evening seminars or parent education sessions on parenting issues.

Four projects felt that, along with enhancing the child's English language skills, it was important for parents to improve their own language skills. This usually meant that the projects offered an English-as-a-second-language (ESL) course for parents in the evenings.

Goals for Staff

In three projects (Hidalgo, TX; Kotzebue, AK; and Fremont, CA) an explicit goal was for staff to develop and test a bilingual curriculum or curriculum materials for preschool children. The Hidalgo, TX, staff developed a school-based curriculum for four-year-old children, and parents devised a home-based curriculum for three-year-old children and their parents. The Kotzebue, AK, staff worked on a curriculum for three-year-old children that would feed into the current curriculum used with older children. The Fremont, CA, staff developed and marketed a 20-unit curriculum for bilingual preschool classes.

Several projects stated goals for the training of staff; in some cases goals extended to the certification of staff in specialty areas (e.g., bilingual education) or through the Child Development Associates (CDA) program. Ten projects stated as a goal that staff be trained further (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK). At times the training goal was expressed in terms of a number of training sessions. The number ranged from one session each quarter in Kansas City to a six-month program in Oaks, OK, and a continuing program in San Antonio, TX. The primary focus of the San Antonio, TX, project was staff development through cluster training sessions for teachers from all four school districts served by the project; on-site observations and post-conference observations; and field visits to model programs. Three projects (Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; and Oklahoma City, OK), wanted staff to achieve certification. All supported paraprofessionals obtaining the CDA credential; some were also supportive of special certification for teachers.

Project Operation and Services

Community Characteristics

Characteristics of the communities varied across project sites. (See Exhibit II-3, Participant Characteristics.) Almost half of the sites were located in rural areas, approximately one-third operated in urban environments, and the remainder in suburban areas. Only one project (San Antonio, TX), encompassed four different school districts and included both rural and urban areas.

While the ethnic composition of the communities also varied, the majority were located in Hispanic communities. Among the second-year projects, seven were located in Hispanic communities and one in a Native American community. One project (Miami, FL), was located in both Hispanic and Haitian communities. The communities were somewhat more diverse among the third-year projects, with only two in solely Hispanic communities and several in mixed Hispanic and Asian communities. The project in Queens, NY, served both an Hispanic and a Greek community in two different schools. Projects in Kotzebue, AK, and St. Paul, MN, served Eskimo and Native American communities respectively. The languages in the communities varied with the ethnic population(s) residing in those locales.

Recruitment

Strategies. All projects used a variety of strategies to recruit children to their programs. Exhibit II-4, Recruitment Strategies, shows the combination of strategies used at each site. Distribution of posters and flyers in the community and announcements in the media--both newspapers and radio--were the most common methods of informing parents about the projects. These methods were used by 11 or 12 out of 14 projects. Brooklyn, NY, and Madera, CA, for example, placed notices in the local newspapers describing the project. Miami, FL, made radio announcements in Haitian-Creole to reach its target population. Recruitment through older

EXHIBIT II-3

Participant Characteristics

Project	Project Year	Number Enrolled Estimated	Number Enrolled Actual	% LEP	Ages	Native Languages	Race/Ethnicity	Population Density	% Low Income
Second-Year Projects									
Madera, CA	88-89	100	76	80%	3 yrs 9 mos	Spanish, English	Hispanic	Rural	90%
	89-90	130	76	72%	5 yrs 4 mos				90%
	90-91	Not Available	72	53%					90%
Miami, FL	88-89	37	30			Spanish, Haitian-Creole	Hispanic, Haitan	Urban	40%
	89-90	35	39	100%	3-5				48%
	90-91	44	70	100%					60%
Kansas City, MO	88-89	70	50[1]	40%	2-5	Spanish, English	Hispanic	Urban	52%
	89-90	70	55[1]	24%					65%
	90-91	55[1]	55[1]	33%					47%
Brooklyn, NY	88-89	60	60	100%	4	Spanish	Hispanic	Urban	100%
	89-90	60	60	100%					100%
	90-91	60	60	100%					100%
Oaks, OK	88-89	80	71	90%	3-5	Cherokee, English	Native American	Rural	68%
	89-90	84	80	93%					65%
	90-91	84	62	85%					68%
Hidalgo, TX	88-89	193	119	84%	4[2]	Spanish	Hispanic	Rural	90%
	89-90	215	131	86%					90%
	90-91	203	132[2]	100%					90%

---

[1] Average number of participants on any given day.

[2] In addition, in December 1990 Hidalgo, TX began serving 38 three-year-olds in a home-based program.

EXHIBIT II-3 (Continued)

Participant Characteristics

Project	Project Year	Number Enrolled Estimated	Number Enrolled Actual	% LEP	Ages	Native Languages	Race/Ethnicity	Population Density	% Low Income
San Antonio, TX	88-89	784	Not Available	Not Available	4-5	Spanish, English	Hispanic	Urban and Rural	Not Available
	89-90	761	661[3]	82%[3]					
	90-91	685	Not Available	Not Available					
Third-Year Projects									
Kotzebue, AK	87-88	25	25		3	Inupiaq, English	Inupiat Eskimo	Rural	100%
	88-89	25	32 screened 26	100%					100%
	89-90	25	38 screened 27	100%					100%
Fillmore, CA	87-88	60[4]	Not Available	75%[4]	3-4	Spanish, English	Hispanic	Rural	77%[5]
	88-89	60[4]	Not Available	66%[4]					63%[5]
	89-90	63[4]	Not Available	60%[4]					54%[5]
Fremont, CA	87-88	170	Not Available	Not Available	4-5	Spanish, Farsi, English	Hispanic, Asian	Suburban	Not Available
	88-89	110	110	60%					70%
	89-90	130	110	61%					72%
St. Paul, MN	87-88	40-60	25[6]	100%	3-5	Ojibway, Dakota, English	Native American	Rural	100%
	88-89	60	25[6]	100%					100%
	89-90	60	25[6]	100%					100%

---

[3] Estimated data.

[4] Younger siblings of enrolled children were unofficially served in this program.

[5] Number of low income families as a percentage of the number of families enrolled.

[6] Average daily attendance; unspecified numbers of children leave the class midday or midyear.

EXHIBIT II-3 (Continued)

Participant Characteristics

Project	Project Year	Number Enrolled Estimated	Number Enrolled Actual	% LEP	Ages	Native Languages	Race/Ethnicity	Population Density	% Low Income
Manhattan, NY	87-88 88-89 89-90	30 30 30	30 30 30	60% 60% 60%	4	Chinese, Spanish, English	Asian, Hispanic, Black	Urban	95% 95% 95%
Queens, NY	87-88 88-89 89-90	48 39 60	55 52 60	100% 100% 100%	4	Greek, Spanish	Greek, Hispanic	Urban	100% 100% 100%
Oklahoma City, OK	87-88 88-89 89-90	40 40 40	62 72 82	84% 94% 94%	3-5	Spanish, Vietnamese, Pakistani, Hindi, English	Hispanic, Vietnamese, Pakistani, Hindu, Native American	Urban	100% 100% 100%
Seattle, WA	87-88 88-89 89-90	40 40 40	30 30 29	100% 100% 100%	4-5	Cambodian, Vietnamese, Chinese, Spanish, Korean	Asian, Hispanic	Suburban	76% 76% 93%

EXHIBIT II-4

Recruitment Strategies[1]

Project	Strategies									
	Open House	Home Visits	Posters/ Flyers	Word of Mouth	Media	Letters to Parents	Referrals	Older Siblings	Community Meetings	Videos
Second-Year Projects										
Madera, CA			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Miami, FL				X	X		X		X	X
Kansas City, MO			X	X	X		X			
Brooklyn, NY			X	X	X			X		
Oaks, OK			X		X			X	X	X
Hidalgo, TX		X	X	X			X	X	X	
Third-Year Projects										
Kotzebue, AK	X		X	X	X			X		
Fillmore, CA	X		X		X	X		X		
Fremont, CA	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
St. Paul, MN	X				X					
Manhattan, NY			X	X	X	X			X	
Queens, NY			X		X			X	X	
Oklahoma City, OK		X	X	X	X		X	X		
Seattle, WA			X				X	X		
TOTALS										
Number	4	3	12	9	11	4	7	10	7	2
Percent	29%	21%	86%	64%	79%	29%	50%	71%	50%	14%

siblings and word of mouth, particularly after a project operated for a year, was also common among projects. Half the projects identified potential candidates through referrals (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA). Madera, CA, for example, received referrals from migrant resource staff; Miami, FL, from Easter Seals and school administrators; Kansas City, MO, from public schools, local health clinics, counseling centers, the Kansas City Department of Family Services, and staff working with the homeless; and Hidalgo, TX, from Head Start for their home-based program for three-year-olds. Half the projects (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; Manhattan, NY; and Queens, NY), also recruited potential candidates through community meetings. Other strategies less frequently used were open houses for parents, letters to parents, home visits, and project videos. The home-visit strategy, though infrequent, was used very effectively in Hidalgo, TX. Two family resource consultants, who staffed the project and lived in the community, conducted a house-to-house survey to identify all three-year-olds living in the district. They explained the project to parents of all eligible candidates and encouraged their participation.

Difficulties in recruitment. Several of the projects experienced some difficulty in recruiting participants to their programs. The reasons for lack of initial enthusiasm for the programs varied among projects. In Oaks, OK, for example, parents were initially unsure of the value of the new program. Several of the parents who were interviewed indicated they had enrolled their children only after seeing friends' children make remarkable progress in the program. In the current project year, the project experienced a decline in applicants. This may be the result of competition from the nearby Head Start program, which just began accepting three-year-old children.

Competition from another preschool program was also a factor that hindered recruitment of participants during the first year of the Brooklyn, NY, project. Parents preferred Giant Step, a

New York City-funded monolingual prekindergarten program, which had a wealth of resources and was already in operation in the two school sites selected for the bilingual project. In addition, there was some reluctance by the parents to enroll their children in a bilingual project where the emphasis was on speaking Spanish. They feared that their children would not learn English. However, by the second year of operation, parental fears were dispelled through support for the project from parents whose children had participated.

There was also reluctance among some parents in Kansas City, MO, to enroll their children in the project because they believed that young children should be at home. Working parents relied on family members as care providers. Over the course of the three years of the project, parents came to understand that preschool can "educate" children. Enrollment in the Kansas City, MO, project was also affected by changing demographics in the city. New immigrants are moving into the northeast, while the Center housing the project is located in the traditionally Hispanic west side. In addition, an Italian-American social services agency in the northeast has targeted services to Asians and Hispanics and is more convenient for parents residing there.

Distance was also a concern for parents in the Queens, NY, project. The school housing the Greek-speaking program was not located near the residences of the Greek families. Lack of free transportation deterred parents from enrolling children in the project.

The Fillmore, CA, project had little difficulty recruiting Spanish-speaking participants for its project but had some difficulty enrolling English-only participants. The English-speaking parents initially chose not to participate because they were under the mistaken impression that this project was an extension of an earlier preschool migrant program targeted to Spanish-speaking families. English-speaking parents were angered that Spanish-speaking families were again the recipients of services that they also needed. Home visits were made to these families to explain the project and alleviate the hostile feelings. Over the course of the years more English-speaking children participated.

Enrollment

Project enrollment in 1989-90 ranged from 25 children in St. Paul, MN, to 131 children in Hidalgo, TX. However, enrollment at the majority of sites was less than 60 (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). Enrollment at the other sites clustered into two ranges: 61 to 100 children and 101 to 140 children. (See Exhibit II-5, Number of Children Enrolled, 1989-90.) Four sites (Madera, CA; Oaks, OK; Fillmore, CA; and Oklahoma City, OK) fell within the first cluster. Enrollment was not an issue in San Antonio, TX, as the project provided technical assistance and not direct services to children.

Two projects increased in size between 1989-90 and 1990-91. The Miami, FL, project extended its services to additional schools, almost doubling the number of children served, from 39 to 70 participants. However, the children in the new schools did not receive the same level of services as those in the original pilot schools. The Hidalgo, TX, site began operating a home-based program for three-year-olds in 1990-91, adding another 38 children.

Low-income. All projects identified participants as low-income if they qualified for free breakfast and/or lunch under federal regulations. According to this definition, the majority of projects served mainly low-income children. (See Exhibit II-6, Percent Low-Income and LEP Participants, 1989-90.) In more than half of the sites (Madera, CA: Brooklyn, NY; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA), more than 90 percent of the participants were identified as low-income. In the other projects, with the exception of Miami, FL, between 51 and 90 percent of the participants were identified as low income. The Miami, FL, project had a relatively low percent of low-income children (48 percent)

EXHIBIT II-5

Number of Children Enrolled, 1989-90[1]

	Number of Children		
Project	20 - 60	61 - 100	101 - 140
Second-Year Projects	Miami, FL Kansas City, MO Brooklyn, NY	Madera, CA Oaks, OK	Hidalgo, TX
Third-Year Projects	Kotzebue, AK Manhattan, NY Queens, NY St. Paul, MN Seattle, WA	Fillmore, CA Oklahoma City, OK	Fremont, CA
TOTALS			
Number	8	4	2
Percent	58%	28%	14%

---

[1] San Antonio, TX is not included in this exhibit because it did not provide direct services to children.

EXHIBIT II-6

Percent Low-Income and LEP Participants, 1989-90[1]

	Percent Low-Income Participants			Percent LEP Participants		
Project	< 50%	51 - 90%	91 - 100%	< 50%	51 - 90%	91 - 100%
Second-Year Projects	Miami, FL	Kansas City, MO Oaks, OK Hidalgo, TX	Madera, CA Brooklyn, NY	Kansas City, MO	Madera, CA Hidalgo, TX	Miami, FL Brooklyn, NY Oaks, OK
Third-Year Projects		Fillmore, CA Fremont, CA	Kotzebue, AK St. Paul, MN Manhattan, NY Queens, NY Oklahoma City, OK Seattle, WA		Fillmore, CA Fremont, CA Manhattan, NY	Kotzebue, AK St. Paul, MN Queens, NY Oklahoma City, OK Seattle, WA
TOTALS						
Number	1	5	8	1	5	8
Percent	7%	36%	57%	7%	36%	57%

---

[1] San Antonio, TX is not included in this exhibit because it did not provide direct services to children.

in 1989-90, but when it expanded to other schools in 1990-91, the percent of low income rose to 60.

Limited English proficient. Projects often enrolled LEP children along with English-speaking children. (See Exhibit II-6, Percent Low-Income and LEP Participants, 1989-90.) Only six projects (Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA) reported 100 percent of their participants as LEP in 1989-90. In 1990-91, Hidalgo, TX, was added to this list when a separate prekindergarten class was created for English proficient children who had previously been served by the project. Two other projects, Oaks and Oklahoma City, OK, reported nearly 100 percent LEP children (93 percent and 94 percent, respectively). Six of the 15 projects identified between 51 and 90 percent of the participants as LEP. Only one second-year project (Kansas City, MO) identified a low percentage (24 percent) of the participants as LEP.

Age. Ages of children served by the projects ranged from two years to five years. Exhibit II-7, Age of Participants Served, 1989-90, provides a breakdown of projects by age of children served and site. Five-year-olds at some project sites (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA) were served within a preschool program, but at others (Oaks, OK, and San Antonio, TX), they were served within a kindergarten program. In Fremont, CA, five-year-olds were served in both prekindergarten and kindergarten programs. Ten of the 15 project sites provided programs for children of multiple ages.

The Fillmore, CA, project officially registered three and four-year-olds; however, younger siblings of registered children also participated in the program. In the first year, 10 additional children ages one to three were served; in the second year, 12 children were served; and, in the third year, the number rose to 20.

EXHIBIT II-7

Age of Participants Served, 1989-90

Project	Preschool				K
	2	3	4	5	5
Second-Year Projects					
Madera, CA		X	X	X	
Miami, FL		X	X	X	
Kansas City, MO	X	X	X	X	
Brooklyn, NY			X		
Oaks, OK		X	X		X
Hidalgo, TX[1]			X		
San Antonio, TX			X		X
Third-Year Projects					
Kotzebue, AK		X			
Fillmore, CA[2]		X	X		
Fremont, CA			X	X	X
St. Paul, MN		X	X		
Manhattan, NY			X		
Queens, NY			X		
Oklahoma City, OK		X	X	X	
Seattle, WA			X	X	

---

[1] Hidalgo, TX began to serve three year olds in 1990-91.

[2] Unofficially, Fillmore, CA serves younger siblings of enrolled students.

Native Language(s). These projects can be distinguished by the number of native language groups represented by the children in the project and by the specific languages included. At two sites (Brooklyn, NY, and Hidalgo, TX), a single language--Spanish--was spoken by all children. Project staff indicated that even the non-LEP children in Hidalgo, TX, were Spanish dominant. (See Exhibit II-3, Participant Characteristics.) In six sites, children spoke English in combination with another language. At four of these sites (Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; San Antonio, TX; and Fillmore, CA), children spoke either Spanish or English. In Oaks, OK, all children spoke some English, but many came from homes where Cherokee was the language in use. In Kotzebue, AK, children spoke a language that is a combination of English and Inupiaq. In two additional sites (Queens, NY, and Miami, FL), children spoke one of two non-English languages. In Queens, NY, Spanish-speaking children were served in one school and Greek-speaking children in another school. In Miami, FL, a bilingual instructor provided services in one school to Spanish-speaking special education children and in another school to Haitian-Creole-speaking special education children.

In the other five sites, multiple language groups were represented: a combination of Spanish, Farsi, and English (Fremont, CA); Chinese, Spanish, and English (Manhattan, NY); Ojibway, Lakota, and English (St. Paul, MN); Spanish, English, and a handful of Asian and Middle Eastern languages (Oklahoma City, OK); and Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Cambodian, and Korean (Seattle, WA).

Two important observations can be made from these data. First, 11 of the 15 projects served at least some Spanish-speaking children. The largest of the linguistic subgroups in the United States is well-represented in this sample of projects. Second, the five sites where multiple language groups were represented had to offer a different sort of bilingual programming from that used in classrooms where children speak the same language. In the classrooms with multiple language groups, English was generally used in the program, with support in children's native languages provided by bilingual staff.

Group Size

Group size is defined as the number of children under the responsibility of a single teacher. In most instances the size of a "group" is equivalent to the number of children in a classroom. However, classrooms with a great deal of space are sometimes staffed by more than one teacher; the group sizes for children in these classrooms are, consequently, smaller than the total number of children in the room. Findings from the National Day Care Study showed that smaller group sizes were associated with more desirable caregiver and child behaviors and with greater gains in tests of cognitive skills over the course of a year in preschool. Study authors recommended a maximum of 20 preschool children per group. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)[7] also sets a group size limit of 20 for four- and five-year-old children, but they recommend that group size for three-year-olds be smaller.

Group size varied among the Special Populations projects that were visited, ranging from approximately 15 preschool children in Brooklyn, NY, to 42 children in the four-year-old group in Kansas City, MO.[8] At least some classes in five of the six projects (Madera, CA; the three-year-old group in Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK, and Hidalgo, TX), met the recommendations of NAEYC; classes in two were larger than the suggested maximum (the four-year-old group in Kansas City, MO, and the preschool in Fremont, CA).

---

[7] Bredekamp, S. (Editor). Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children From Birth Through Age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1987.

[8] Miami, FL, was not included in this section because LEP children were served within the larger special education classrooms on a pull-out basis. San Antonio, TX, was also excluded because it was a support services project and did not provide direct services to children.

Retention

Most projects did not view retention as a major issue. They recognized that the population served was highly mobile, and it was common for families to move out of neighborhoods or return to their native countries. Retention rates varied across projects, but the majority of sites indicated that between 71 and 80 percent of the participants who enrolled in the project remained throughout the year. (See Exhibit II-8, Retention Rates, 1989-90.) Three of the 14 projects (Miami, FL; Kotzebue, AK; and Fremont, CA), had retention rates between 91 and 100 percent.

At two sites, Kansas City, MO, and Hidalgo, TX, retention rates were particularly low in 1989-90, 44 percent and 60 percent, respectively. Financial concerns were reported to be the major reason for high turnover in Kansas City, MO. Parents must pay a fee for children's attendance. When they lose a job, it is not possible to continue to finance preschool. In addition, parents often visit relatives in Mexico for extended periods of time and take their children out of school; there may not be a slot open when they return. Finally, a family may lose eligibility for Social Service Block Grant (Title XX) preschool funds (one of the program's multiple funding sources) because of the child's lack of attendance, thereby losing a subsidy that helps them to afford preschool. The Hidalgo, TX, project, located one-half mile from the Mexican border, serves primarily migrant workers who usually remain in Hidalgo during the growing season and return to Mexico afterwards. Many families have established two residences, one in Mexico and one in Hidalgo, and frequently move from one to the other.

Schedules of Operation

Project schedules of operation varied across three dimensions--hours of operation, number of days per week, and number of weeks per year. (See Exhibit II-9, Project Operations.) For purposes of analysis, hours of operation were divided into half-day programs (operating up to four

EXHIBIT II-8

Retention Rates, 1989-90[1]

Project	Retention Rates			
	< 70%	71 - 80%	81 - 90%	91 - 100%
Second-Year Projects	Kansas City, MO Hidalgo, TX	Madera, CA Brooklyn, NY Oaks, OK		Fremont, CA Miami, FL
Third-Year Projects		Manhattan, NY Oklahoma City, OK Seattle, WA	Fillmore, CA St. Paul, MN Queens, NY	Kotzebue, AK
TOTALS				
Number	2	6	3	3
Percent	14%	44%	21%	21%

---

[1] San Antonio, TX is excluded from this exhibit as it is not responsible for retention.

EXHIBIT II-9

Project Operations

Project	Classification[1]	Schedule				Amount of Grant/ Budget Per Preschool Child	Parental Involvement
		Hours/Day	Days/Week	Weeks/Year	Number of Years		
Second-Year Projects							
Madera, CA	Public	3-1/2 hours	4 days	36 weeks	1	$98,469.00/ 1,296.00	Parent meetings and training Volunteers Parent-teacher conference
Miami, FL	Public	Pull-out	5 days	40 weeks	2	$152,000.00/ 5,241.00	Parent training Parent-teacher conference
Kansas City, MO	Private	10-1/2 hours	5 days	52 weeks	1-3	$85,997.00/ 1,564.00	Parent training Parent Advisory Council Parent-teacher conference
Brooklyn, NY	Public	3 hours	5 days	40 weeks	1	$304,421.00/ 5,074.00	Parent training Volunteers ESL classes and native language instruction
Oaks, OK	Public	7 hours	5 days	36 weeks	1-3	$175,109.00/ 5,472.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council Parent-teacher conference
Hidalgo, TX	Public	7 hours	5 days	36 weeks	1	$188,557.00/ 1,439.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council 3 yr. old - home-based learning Curriculum development
San Antonio, TX	Private	3 hours	5 days	40 weeks	1-2	$224,771.00/ 619.00	Parent training

EXHIBIT II-9 (Continued)

Project Operations

Project	Classification[1]	Schedule				Amount of Grant/ Budget Per Preschool Child	Parental Involvement
		Hours/Day	Days/Week	Weeks/Year	Number of Years		
Third-Year Projects							
Kotzebue, AK	Private	3-1/2 (3 hours summer)	4 days	50 weeks	1 year	$123,117.00/ 4,560.00	Parent meetings and training Parent newsletter Elders involved Parent-teacher conference
Fillmore, CA	Public	2-1/2 hours	4 days	30 weeks	1-2 years	$93,497.00/ 1,484.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent-teacher conference
Fremont, CA	Public	Prekindergarten: 3 hours Kindergarten: 3-1/2 hours	5 days	38 weeks	2 years	$106,720.00/ 970.00	Parent training Volunteers Family classes ESL classes Parent-teacher conference
St. Paul, MN	Private	6-1/2 hours	5 days	40 weeks	1 year	$67,011.00/ 2,680.00	Parent training Open house Community feasts Parent-teacher conference
Manhattan, NY	Public	6-1/2 hours	5 days	36 weeks	1 year	$254,426.00/ 8,481.00	Parent training Volunteers ESL and GED classes
Queens, NY	Public	2-1/2 hours	4 days	36 weeks	1 year	$195,000.00/ 3,250.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council ESL classes
Oklahoma City, OK	Private	87-89: 3 hours 89-90: 5-1/2 hours	5 days	36 weeks	2 years	$57,919.00/ 706.00	Parent training Monthly meetings Family counseling
Seattle, WA	Public	2 1/2 hours	87-88: 5 days 88-90: 4-5 days	36 weeks	1-2 years	$70,050.00/ 2,416.00	Parent meetings Volunteers Classroom visits Parent-teacher conference

hours a day), school-day programs (approximately six hours a day), full-day programs (eight to 10 hours a day), and pull-out programs. The majority of both second- and third-year projects operated half-day programs (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). Five projects provided school-day programs (Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX;[9] St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK). In the first two years of operation, Oklahoma City, OK, had operated a half-day program, but, it extended the program to a full school day in 1989-90. Kansas City, MO, operated a full-day program of 10-1/2 hours to serve the needs of its working parents.

Miami, FL, was a "pull-out" program that operated during the regular school day. The project's bilingual instructor pulled LEP children from the ongoing activity of their exceptional student classroom and spent approximately 30 minutes per day working with each group.

The majority of both second- and third-year projects operated five-day-a-week programs. Only Madera, CA; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; and Queens, NY, operated four-day-a-week programs. Seattle, WA, provided alternating weeks of four- and five-day programs. Projects that operated only four-day programs generally provided staff development and/or parent conferences on the fifth day. Miami, FL, also used the fifth day for home visits.

Most of the projects provided services for children during the school year so that the program lasted 36 to 40 weeks. In Fillmore, CA, it was a shorter period--30 weeks. In Kansas City, MO, and Kotzebue, AK, however, the projects operated year-round.

Instructional Methods

Strategies. Each project employed a variety of instructional strategies to meet its goals. These included whole-group instruction, small-group instruction, and individualized instruction.

---

[9] In 1990-91 Hidalgo, TX, added a home-based program for three-year-old children. A schedule of operation was not formalized at the time of the site visit.

The amount of time devoted to each type of instruction varied both across projects and within projects over the course of the year. Whole-group instruction was generally provided during circle time when children arrived in school and at the end of the day. Fillmore, CA, for example, began each day with a Magic Circle. At this time, parents (who attended classes with their children) learned techniques for teaching their children; new curriculum themes were introduced; and previously introduced themes were reinforced through role playing, singing, and dancing. Project classes also met as a whole group during story hours, ethnic celebrations, and field trips.

Small-group instruction was an integral part of each program. Small-group instruction often took place in the learning centers organized in each of the classrooms. Individualized instruction was generally provided to participants on an as-needed basis.

The Miami, FL, project was organized somewhat differently. A special bilingual instructor provided at least 30 minutes of instruction to LEP children in each of the special education classes served by the project. Both individualized and small-group instruction were provided, depending on the number of project participants in that classroom and the needs of the particular child.

Differences across classrooms did not appear large in terms of schedules for daily activities or mix in type of instruction. Rather, there were differences in the role of teachers that were observed in the sites visited. Specifically, teachers in three sites (Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; and one classroom in Fremont, CA), directed the majority of activities during the day. Whether these activities involved the entire class or small groups of children, little time was available for child-initiated and child-directed activity. For example, in Kansas City, MO, when the class was divided into small groups to work in learning centers, an aide or teacher accompanied each group. In the block corner, the aide announced to the children that they would build a castle, and then told each child what size block was needed. The children brought the blocks; the aide built the castle. Similarly, when language activities were conducted in each of the more teacher-oriented classrooms, the adults usually asked questions and the children answered; often drill was the chosen method of instruction. In the other projects observed (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK), teachers set an environment that encouraged children to explore and acted more as facilitators than directors of that exploration.

Curriculum. Curriculum was generally designed to provide language-enriching experiences and to foster physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development. It was organized around several themes, which varied from project to project. Often projects emphasized cultural themes (e.g., traditional Inupiat values in Kotzebue, AK; traditional fall Ojibway activities in St. Paul, MN; and Pan American festivals in Brooklyn, NY). Curriculum themes also included the self, family, community, seasons, and holidays.

Six of the 13[10] projects adapted materials from existing curricula. Two projects in New York--Brooklyn and Queens--indicated that they based their curriculum on New York City's early childhood curriculum, Three, Four, Open the Door. Brooklyn, NY, and Seattle, WA, used the ALERTA model, which emphasized cultural diversity. Kansas City, MO, used Nuevo Amanecer, a curriculum developed by the Intercultural Development Research Association. St. Paul, MN, used the DIAL kit in which classes followed themes such as seasons and holidays. Oklahoma City, OK, modeled their program on the Montessori method for the first two years but switched to the High/Scope curriculum (based on Piaget's developmental theory) in the last year because administrators felt it was better accepted in the early childhood arena, easier to use, and more easily understood by teachers. Oaks, OK, did not base its curriculum on a single model but incorporated a number of different approaches with themes based on children's interest. Fillmore, CA, Manhattan, NY, and Madera, CA, did not provide any information on the types of curriculum models they used.

---

[10] Miami, FL, was not included in this analysis because it provides services to special education LEP children within the larger exceptional education program. San Antonio, TX, was also excluded because it is a support services project for teachers who use the curriculum of their individual school districts.

Three projects (Hidalgo, TX; Kotzebue, AK; and Fremont, CA) focused on developing comprehensive curricula for their programs. The curriculum developed in Hidalgo, TX, was based on research in early childhood education and bilingual education and an extensive review of early childhood curriculum materials. Teachers, the Project Director, and a curriculum consultant developed a curriculum for four-year-olds, while parents and the Early Childhood Coordinator developed a curriculum for three-year-olds. The four-year-olds' curriculum emphasized language development and cognitive skill development. It consisted of 16 curriculum units, each containing six learning strands: Language Development/ESL, Cognition, Communications, Motor Skills, Fine Arts, and Social-Emotional. Each unit was designed to be taught over a two-week period and consisted of 10 lessons, a reteach lesson in which the same concept was taught in a new way, and an evaluation lesson in which the teacher informally evaluated the children to assess whether they had mastered the concepts of the unit. ESL, English language development, and Spanish language development were emphasized throughout the curriculum. The children's cultural heritage was reinforced through holidays, preparation of native dishes, songs, and stories.

The three-year-olds' curriculum used a home-family model with the home as the educational center and the family as instructors. Parents developed stories and activities for their children around six themes--the body, the family, clothing, food, domestic animals, and the community. Initially the Project Director, and then the Early Childhood Coordinator, worked with parents, making certain that activities were developmentally appropriate and that the spelling and grammar were correct.

Kotzebue, AK, also developed a curriculum with a goal of helping children develop a strong English language base while learning about things related to their environment and Inupiat culture. Inupiat elders provided input regarding the types of traditional values (e.g., sharing, respect for others, love for children, domestic skills) to be taught and the types of games and toys to be included. The curriculum, Uqata - Let's Talk, was organized around themes and seasonal cultural activities based on Inupiat values and culture. Each lesson included a designated theme and Inupiat value, an objective, materials to use, recommended group size, key words and phrases, and enumerated activities. Examples of weekly and monthly themes include "Things We Do in Winter," "Families/Homes," "Dog Sledding," and "Whale Hunting."

Fremont, CA, developed a 20-unit preschool and a nine-unit kindergarten curriculum guide during the course of the project. Each preschool unit covered about two weeks of instruction and contained copies of materials such as games, songs, and literature, as well as a home study guide. Cultural awareness was the major theme emphasized throughout all the units in the curriculum. Their approach was to foster an appreciation of all cultures. The "family" unit, for example, began with a comparison of different fictional bear families--the "Berenstain Bears" and "Goldilocks and the Three Bears"--and followed with a discussion of different types of families, including cultural differences.

Language Usage

Projects used various approaches to develop oral language proficiency. They can be grouped into four categories: instruction in the child's native language with a gradual introduction of English; instruction in English with support in the native language as needed; English for students of other languages (ESOL) instruction; and Spanish/English models.

Instruction in the native language. Seven projects (Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), provided instruction in the child's native language. However, among these projects, the amount of native language instruction varied. For example, Brooklyn, NY, and Hidalgo, TX, emphasized the development of native language proficiency before introducing a second language, while Fremont, CA, introduced Spanish and English simultaneously during whole-group instruction.

The Brooklyn, NY, project, designed to develop Spanish language proficiency in order to accelerate the learning of a second language, was based on research in bilingual education and on research findings by the Project Coordinator that showed that if a child's native language is developed, the child will be better able to transfer skills into a second language. Spanish was spoken exclusively for the first few months of the year, with occasional introduction of specific English words for specific situations. Spanish was reinforced through songs, dances, and stories, as well as through general classroom conversations/activities. Children were encouraged to speak primarily in Spanish, even those who had some fluency in English. (Spanish was the dominant language of children in the first year of the program, while in the second and third years more English fluency was noted.) This was done by immediately translating words used in English to Spanish and asking the children to repeat them.

English was introduced initially during circle time activities, story telling, and music, and was later incorporated into conversational classroom time. As more English was used for specific situations, teachers focused on giving children the correct words and usage in both languages. By the end of the year, both languages were spoken equally by teachers and children.

Children in Hidalgo, TX, had very little facility with English at the beginning of the year. Their facility with Spanish in terms of vocabulary and sentence structure was also limited. To expand the children's Spanish vocabulary, teachers spoke only Spanish in the classroom at the beginning of the year. The content area of the curriculum was taught only in Spanish, with the exception of the 45 minutes devoted each day to language arts/ESL. During the ESL lesson, we observed that; on the site visit the teacher asked a question in English and repeated it in Spanish. Children responded in Spanish and were given the English words by the teacher. The teacher also fostered Spanish fluency through repetition. Children were asked to repeat words and phrases introduced through the curriculum units. Group activities and games were also in Spanish.

In addition to the ESL curriculum, the only other English phrases spoken in Hidalgo were commands for children (e.g., come here, sit down). As children become more proficient in English and as vocabulary increases, more English will be introduced. By the end of the year, approximately 25 percent of the content area will be in English.

The emphasis on speaking Spanish did not appear as strong in the other four programs providing instruction in the native language. The Fremont, CA, project used both Spanish and English; the choice of language depended on the activity. First, during whole-group instruction, children were taught in Spanish and English on alternating days. If a child was unable to communicate in the language of the day, the child's primary language was acceptable. Second, in small-group activities such as learning centers, reading, and exploration time, children were grouped by native language and instructed in their primary language supplemented by sheltered Spanish or English. Third, the project ensured equal status of the Spanish and English languages by having materials in all subject areas, displays, and children's work on display in both languages.[11]

In the Fillmore, CA, project, teachers provided instruction in Spanish to the Spanish-speaking children at the beginning of each year but introduced English as the participants' English language proficiency increased. By the time participants entered kindergarten, 95 percent were fully bilingual. Similarly, in Oklahoma City, OK, teachers typically spoke in Spanish to the Spanish-speaking children--so that the children understood the concepts--and then gradually introduced English. While the majority of participants had little comprehension or fluency in English when they entered the program, by the time they completed the program (after two years), they could understand and speak English fairly well (though they were not fluent).

---

[11] The Fremont, CA, project also supplemented two state-sponsored sheltered English prekindergarten classes. The sheltered English students came from over 80 different language backgrounds including Spanish, Farsi, Japanese, and Chinese. In these classes sheltered English (the use of simple vocabulary and sentence structure) was the primary means of instruction.

Teachers used Spanish in the classrooms in the Kansas City, MO, project in several ways. First, children were grouped for circle time according to their native language. (About one-quarter of the participants were Spanish-speaking LEP children.) This grouping was maintained throughout the year. Second, all of the non-Spanish-speaking groups were taught Spanish. For example, in the circle time activities with fruit that we observed, teachers introduced the Spanish and English words for the various fruits. Third, the head teacher spoke Spanish almost exclusively. All children were thus exposed to a speaker of Spanish.

The Queens, NY, project operated one program for Spanish-speaking LEP children and one program for Greek-speaking LEP children. When the program first began, teachers emphasized the child's native language but, as the children's English proficiency increased, more English was used. Children learned English by using the language in meaningful, functional ways, such as by asking questions, making statements about themselves, expressing their ideas and feelings, and making requests of others. The native language was always reinforced in class through songs, stories, etc.

Instruction in English. Five projects (Oaks, OK, Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; and Seattle, WA), provided instruction primarily in English. This was true in Kotzebue, AK, at least in part, because the project could not find any fluent Inupiaq speakers. In addition, their curriculum goal was to help children develop a strong English language base while learning about things related to their own environment and Inupiat culture.

Most children in the St. Paul, MN, project spoke English as a first language but lacked full proficiency because Ojibway or Dakota[12] was the language of the home. Group instruction was provided in English, with bilingual aides translating to the non-English language when necessary.

Similarly, the Native American children served by the Oaks, OK, project spoke English as a first language but tested below their age group because Cherokee was the language of the home. The project, designed to develop the children's English language abilities, provided instruction in English. The language experience approach, focusing on productive and receptive language skills, was the main theoretical emphasis.

Approximately 60 percent of the participants in the Manhattan, NY, project were Chinese-speaking LEP children. However, to foster English language development and fluency, the teacher and paraprofessional always spoke to the children in English. Even during story hour, the story was read in English. Chinese was only spoken when the children could not understand English.

The Seattle, WA, project enrolled Asian LEP children, the majority of whom were Cambodian and Vietnamese. Instruction involving the entire class was provided in English, with bilingual aides translating on an individual basis. However, if a particularly difficult subject was taught, children were grouped by and taught in their native language.

English to speakers of other languages. In the Miami, FL, project, English was taught through ESOL strategies. In the Haitian-Creole program, the Bilingual Instructor used Haitian-Creole approximately 80 percent of the time, especially with children who had mental disabilities. When she used English, she tended to say a sentence in one language and then repeat it in the other. The Bilingual Instructor in the Spanish-speaking program encouraged the children to speak English in class and worked to help with their expression. This was accomplished largely by repeating in English what the children said in Spanish.

---

[12] Please note that the language of the Lakota Sioux is Dakota.

Alternate Spanish/English models. Madera, CA, was the only project that provided a bilingual team-teaching model using one English-speaking adult and one Spanish-speaking adult to model the use of each language in the classroom. This method was chosen because research indicated that modeling was better received and languages less confused if two persons equally represented the two languages. All activities directed by the English-model teacher used English; activities directed by the Spanish-model teacher used Spanish. Teachers reinforced activities in two languages by constructing parallel activities that used the same vocabulary. For example, during the first circle time, the English-model teacher said "Good morning" to each child and had the child greet her in English, discussed the calendar (counting up to four in English and reciting the days of the week in English), discussed the weather, and talked about appropriate clothing through the use of a flannel board. During the second circle time, the Spanish-model teacher reviewed the calendar and had children count to four in Spanish, named the days of the week in Spanish, and used the flannel board to discuss clothing. Children were encouraged to repeat vocabulary in Spanish.

Materials and Equipment

In the course of each site visit, staff members had the opportunity to observe in at least two classrooms. This observation involved the completion of a classroom checklist. Each room was checked as having or not having equipment and materials judged appropriate for the preschool setting. Exhibit II-10, Presence of Appropriate Materials and Equipment shows the results of the observations.

EXHIBIT II-10

Presence of Appropriate Materials and Equipment, 1989-90[1]

Criteria	Second-Year Projects							
	Fremont, CA	Madera, CA	Brooklyn, NY	Kansas City, MO	Oaks, OK	Hidalgo, TX	Number	Percent
Furnishings: Routine Care	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Furnishings: Learning	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Furnishings: Relaxation	1/2	1/2	1/2			1/2	2	33
Room Arrangement	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Child-related Displays	1/2	X	X		X		3.5	58
Receptive Lang. Experiences	X	X	X	1/2	X	X	5.5	92
Reasoning Experiences	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Fine Motor Activities	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Space for Gross Motor	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Gross Motor Equipment	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Creativity: Art	X	X	X		X	X	5	83
Creativity: Music/Movement	X	X	X		X	X	5	83
Creativity: Blocks	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100
Creativity: Sand/Water	1/2	X	X		X		3.5	58
Creativity: Dramatic Play	1/2	X	X		X	1/2	4	67
Social Dev't: Space to be Alone	1/2						.5	8
Social Dev't: Cultural Awareness	1/2	X	X		X		3.5	58
Provisions for Handicapped	X	X	X	X	X	X	6	100

---

[1] Miami, FL and San Antonio, TX are not included in the exhibit because the projects are not responsible for organizing the classrooms.

Only six of the sites that were visited appear on the Exhibit. Two of the sites (Miami, FL, and San Antonio, TX), could not be rated on these measures because neither of them operate the classrooms. In the Miami program, staff enter existing classrooms for special needs children and work with individuals or small groups of LEP children for designated periods of time. Bilingual project staff have not designed the classroom setting, nor do they have responsibility for that setting. The San Antonio project is primarily a training program where staff work with preschool and kindergarten teachers, and the teachers then design and manage their own classrooms.

There were some measurable differences in materials and equipment present in the six projects. These can be seen in the distribution of scores on the Exhibit. An "x" means that the item was observed in each of the classrooms at the site. A score of "1/2" means either that one classroom had the required equipment and the other did not or that one of two criteria were met by both classrooms. A blank means that neither classroom met the criteria for the item.

Space and furnishings. The first five items rated concern the use of space and the furnishings in the classroom. All classrooms in all sites had furnishings for routine care (cubbies for the storage of children's possessions), furnishings to aide the learning process (child-sized tables and chairs; open shelves for storage of materials), and an appropriate room arrangement (three or more learning centers; easy visual supervision). But no site was fully prepared in its furnishings for relaxation (upholstered chair; rug area). Fremont, CA; Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Hidalgo, TX, had rug areas, but no site had the sort of relaxation area where children could go to snuggle into a chair or couch and read.

Half of the sites had child-related displays on their walls; half did not. That is, in Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, there were displays of commercially-made and teacher-made materials as well as child-made materials, but the latter sort predominated. But child-made materials predominated in only one of two preschool classrooms in Fremont, CA, and there was little to no display of child-made materials in Kansas City, MO, and Hidalgo, TX.

Language/Reasoning experiences. Nearly every classroom observed offered children extensive opportunities for receptive language and reasoning experiences. There were numerous children's books, picture games, records and tapes, size and shape toys, sorting games, and other sorts of learning games. The exceptions were the classrooms in Kansas City, MO. It had some children's books (though none in Spanish), little in the way of picture lotto or other picture games, and the record player and tape deck were tucked away.

Fine and gross motor experiences. The space and equipment for both fine and gross motor activities were appropriate at all six sites. Everyone had access to such fine motor toys as beads, puzzles, Legos, and scissors. Every school had space for gross motor activities that was sufficient and safe. Outdoor play areas had a variety of equipment for children's use.

Creative activities. Half of the sites were fully stocked in materials and equipment for a variety of creative activities, but the other half of the sites were not. Specifically, Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, had art materials (crayons, markers, chalk, paints, easels, play dough, clay, and colored paper), equipment for music and movement activities (musical instruments, a phonograph or tape player, records or tapes, and dance props), blocks, sand and water play area with toys, and dramatic play props. One preschool classroom in Fremont, CA, was well equipped with all of these materials, but the other lacked equipment for sand and water play and for dramatic play. Kansas City, MO, had blocks but little in the way of other creative materials. Hidalgo, TX, classrooms lacked sand and water play areas and only one had the materials for dramatic play.

Social development. Most of the classrooms observed did not have space for children to be alone. It is, perhaps, appropriate to match this finding with their lack of comfortable chairs or a sofa for children to use for reading. The reason for the decision not to have such materials or space may well be that these are (mostly) part-day classrooms, and the schedules for the day are filled with activities. Unlike full-day classrooms where, for example, some children may wake from a nap earlier than others and seek space to look at books or be alone, children in these classrooms are fully occupied with activities in learning centers, small groups, or the whole group.

The fact that some of the classrooms lack the materials expected for "cultural awareness" is a surprise. We expected these classrooms, more than the average preschool classroom, to have multiracial displays on the walls, books concerning non-white children, and tapes and records of children from different cultures. We also expected that cultural sensitivity would extend to the presence of non-sexist displays, books, records, and tapes. We found such cultural awareness in Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, and in one classroom in Fremont, CA; but Kansas City, MO, and Hidalgo, TX, did not show a variety of children in wall displays, books, or records and tapes.

Provisions for exceptional children. All of the buildings visited were wheelchair-accessible, some with a ramp coming into the building, access to classroom areas, and access to outdoor play areas.

Summary. By and large, the classrooms observed during the site visits had appropriate space allocations and furnishings, equipment for fine and gross motor activities, and materials for language and reasoning activities. Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, showed cultural awareness in their choice of materials and had appropriate materials for creative activities, but this was not the case at the other three sites. Most of the classrooms did not have space for children to be alone or the furnishings to encourage such behavior; they also did not have a daily schedule that encouraged such a time.

It is interesting to note that the three projects with limited displays of child-made materials and limited supplies of creative materials (Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; and one classroom in Fremont, CA), were also those observed to emphasize teacher-directed learning in the classroom (see section on Instructional Strategies). It seems probable that the teachers in these classrooms store creative materials until the time they have set for such activities. They seem to value commercial and teacher-made displays over child-made materials, perhaps because these are their examples to children of the way things should be done, just as their behavior is a model for children's learning.

Non-Instructional Services

Projects provided a variety of non-instructional services to participants. Among the services frequently provided were transportation, breakfast and/or lunch, health screenings, and counseling and referrals. (See Exhibit II-11, Non-Instructional Services, 1989-90.) Many of these services were funded by school districts if the project was housed in a school district. (Ten of the 14 projects were operated through school districts.)

Transportation was provided by 10 of the 14 projects. Six school districts provided funding for transportation to participants in projects housed within their district (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; and Seattle, WA). Projects operated by independent agencies (Kotzebue, AK, and St. Paul, MN) supported transportation through institutional funds. Fund-raising efforts supported transportation in Oklahoma City, OK. Project funds and the United Way supported transportation in Kansas City, MO.

Seven school districts provided free breakfast and/or lunch to those children who met federal eligibility requirements (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; Manhattan, NY; and Queens, NY). Three independent agencies that provided free breakfast and/or lunch were funded through a variety of sources. The Kotzebue, AK, breakfast program

EXHIBIT II-11

Non-Instructional Services, 1989-90[1]

Project	Type of Service					
	Transportation	Breakfast/ Lunch	Counseling Referrals	Health Clinics/ Screening	School Nurse	Special Ed
Second-Year Projects						
Madera, CA	X	X	X		X	
Miami, FL	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kansas City, MO	X	X	X	X		
Brooklyn, NY		X		X	X	
Oaks, OK	X		X		X	X
Hidalgo, TX	X	X	X	X	X	
Third-Year Projects						
Kotzebue, AK	X	X				
Fillmore, CA	X	X	X			
Fremont, CA	X		X	X		
St. Paul, MN	X		X	X		
Manhattan, NY		X	X	X	X	
Queens, NY		X		X	X	
Oklahoma City, OK	X	X	X	X		
Seattle, WA	X		X	X	X	
TOTALS						
Number	11	10	11	10	8	2
Percent	79%	71%	79%	71%	57%	14%

---

[1] San Antonio, TX is excluded from this exhibit as it is not responsible for non-instructional services.

was funded by the state's Department of Education Food Service Program; individual contributions and grants from private organizations supported the breakfast and lunch program in Oklahoma City, OK; and the Child and Adult Care Food Program financed meals for more than half of the children in the Kansas City, MO, project.

Counseling referrals to outside agencies were provided by 11 of the 14 projects. Project staff who had developed close rapport with parents of project participants generally provided this service on an informal basis. In several projects (e.g., Brooklyn, NY, and Miami, FL), the project staff also assisted parents by translating information for them.

Ten sites (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA), provided health screenings for participants. These generally included vision and hearing screenings, but in some projects (e.g., Manhattan, NY, and Hidalgo, TX), they included dental screenings. In the Manhattan, NY, project, children had access to a dental screening program through New York University Dental School. School nurses were available in nine of the projects when needed by children. Two projects (Miami, FL, and Oaks, OK) provided special education services to participants; the range of services provided by the school district in Miami, FL, in this area was extensive as this project was targeted to the exceptional student population.

Parent Involvement

Although not a requirement of the Special Populations Preschool projects, parental involvement was an important component of all the projects. At most sites, it took the form of volunteer activities; parent training, usually through workshops, provided specifically by the project or through the school district; parent advisory councils; and parent-teacher conferences.

(See Exhibit II-12, Parental Involvement in Child-Oriented Activities, 1989-90.)[13] At one site, (Hidalgo, TX) parents also played a key role in developing curriculum for three-year-olds and providing home-based learning. At another site (Kotzebue, AK), the elders in the community provided input into the curriculum by indicating the cultural values and the types of toys and games that should be included.

Volunteer activities. Ten of the 14 project sites reported that parent volunteer activities were an important part of their project. The types of activities varied across projects. In the Fillmore, CA, project, for example, parents came to class with their children and took turns being the "teacher" during instructional activities. They also assisted in classroom activities and provided snacks to help defray the costs of having their younger children attend classes with prekindergarten siblings. In the first year of project operation, parents also held a fund-raising dinner and a "graduation" luncheon and turned the proceeds over to the district for their children's education. Parents in the Brooklyn, NY, project, in addition to participating in holiday programs and classroom activities, were responsible for the lending library maintained in each classroom. "Parent librarians" checked books out to other parents to read to their children in the evenings. Along with the books, parents were provided with an activity sheet giving them questions to ask their children about the book, space for them to write down their child's response, and space for the child to color or draw what he or she remembered most about the book. This program reinforced the learning objectives for this age group and strengthened parental participation and cooperation within the program.

---

[13] San Antonio, TX, is not included on the chart because it is a support services contract. However, parent workshops have been an integral part of the project. IDRA staff provided three parent workshops to each of the four school districts receiving project services. These workshops supplemented the workshops provided by the individual districts.

EXHIBIT II-12

Parental Involvement in Child-Oriented Activities, 1989-90[1]

	Activities					
Project	Volunteer Activities	Parent Training	Home-Based Learning	Parent Advisory Councils	Curriculum Development	Parent-Teacher Conferences
Second-Year Projects						
Madera, CA	X	X[2]				X
Miami, FL		X	X			X
Kansas City, MO		X		X		X
Brooklyn, NY	X	X				
Oaks, OK	X	X		X		X
Hidalgo, TX	X	X	X	X	X	
Third-Year Projects						
Kotzebue, AK		X			X	X
Fillmore, CA	X	X				X
Fremont, CA	X	X[3]		X		X
St. Paul, MN	X	X		X		X
Manhattan, NY	X	X				
Queens, NY	X	X		X		
Oklahoma City, OK		X				
Seattle, WA	X	X		X		X
TOTALS						
Number	10	14	2	7	2	9
Percent	73%	100%	14%	50%	14%	64%

---

[1] San Antonio, TX is excluded from this exhibit.

[2] Parent training is provided only through the elementary schools.

[3] Only one parent training workshop was sponsored by the project; the district supports other workshops.

Parent training. Parent workshops were offered at all project sites. At most sites, the project provided at least some of the workshops. If these sites were within a school district, they were supplemented by workshops that the district sponsored. In Fremont, CA, for example, the project funded only one workshop for parents, but several parents actively participated in the district-supported workshops. In Madera, CA, however, workshops were only provided through the elementary school.

The number of workshops offered and the topics discussed varied with the project. Kotzebue, AK, for example, held workshops four times a year, while Brooklyn, NY, held them 13 times a year, and Queens, NY, held them on a weekly basis. Each project offered a range of workshop topics. A sample of some of the topics included: child-related activities for parent and child at home (Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; Fillmore, CA; and St. Paul, MN); safety (Brooklyn and Manhattan, NY); parenting skills (Hidalgo, TX, and Manhattan, NY); developing language and behavior management (Miami, FL); and AIDS (Kansas City, MO).

The Hidalgo, TX, project had an extensive parent training component that included curriculum development workshops, Bowdoin Method training sessions, and home educator training in which a select number of parents were trained to work with other parents in the home implementing the three-year-olds' curriculum. Nine curriculum development workshops were held for parents of three-year-olds to discuss the home-based curriculum. Ten parents then volunteered to develop the curriculum. The Bowdoin Method training provided 10 two-hour sessions in effective parenting for parents of three and four-year-olds.

Parent Advisory Councils. At seven sites (Kansas City, MO; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA), parents participated in Parent Advisory Councils. None of the Councils had decision-making authority. Some guided program development through offering suggestions on program improvement or on topics for parent workshops (Queens, NY, and Oaks, OK). Two sites (Seattle, WA and Oaks, OK) had ad hoc committees. In the Kansas City, MO, project, parents signed a contract when they enrolled their child in the program that stated (among other things) they would attend at least three of the four meetings of the Parent Advisory Group each year. At these meetings, project staff introduced themselves, talked about opportunities for children and parents, and discussed and planned ethnic festivals and special community events. To facilitate parent participation, child care was provided, meetings were held right after work, and meetings were kept short.

Parent-Teacher conferences. Nine of the 14 projects (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; and Seattle, WA), also held parent-teacher conferences. At some project sites (e.g., Miami, FL, and Seattle, WA), they were part of the scheduled home visits. At others (e.g., Kansas City, MO, and Oaks, OK), there were regularly scheduled conferences at the preschool.

Parent recruitment. Most projects indicated an active parent involvement component. While it may have been difficult initially to recruit parents, once "hooked," they were able to maintain the active involvement of the parents. Several factors seemed to enhance the participation of parents. These included personal contact, child care for younger siblings, stipends for workshop attendance, and home visits.

The "personal touch" was provided at the Brooklyn, NY, and Oaks, OK, sites by staff who waited in the front of the school building in the morning to greet parents when they dropped their child off. Staff talked to the parents about the workshops and encouraged them to attend. Once parents recognized the benefit of the workshops to themselves and their children, they continued to attend. Parents at several sites (e.g., Brooklyn, NY; San Antonio, TX; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA), were invited to bring their younger children with them. At some sites there was a child care provider available; at others the children attended the workshops with the parents. Refreshments were generally served. At the Hidalgo, TX, site, parents who participated in the Bowdoin Training received a stipend for babysitting expenses or gasoline. In addition, the Family Resource Consultants who staffed the project drove parents to sessions if they did not have their own transportation.

Home visits also seemed to have a positive effect on the parents in some projects. In Miami, FL, for example, the bilingual instructors believed the visits strengthened the bonds between parents and teachers and contributed to the parents' involvement in their children's education.

At two project sites (Kotzebue, AK, and Madera, CA), it appeared difficult to solicit parent involvement in the program. At both sites parents were reluctant to participate because they looked at the preschool program more as a source of babysitting than school. In Madera, CA, parents also claimed they could not participate because of lack of child care for younger children, work schedules, and transportation difficulties.

Educational and Community Linkages

This study focused on two types of project linkages--linkages with the educational community, and linkages with the broader community. Site visits and telephone interviews showed that linkages with the educational community were quite strong when the project was housed in a school district, and linkages with the larger community were strong when the project was operated by an independent agency.

Educational Linkages

Project linkages with the educational community can be grouped by their auspices, separating projects that were housed within public school districts and projects that were operated through independent agencies. (See Exhibit II-9, Project Operations, 1989-90.)

School district affiliation. In projects that were affiliated with a school district, the district was responsible for housing, administering, and sometimes staffing the project. Districts provided the facilities, utilities, custodial services, and, where required (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; and Seattle, WA), transportation for project participants. Staff development provided a strong link between project personnel and school district teachers. At times, school districts provided staff development workshops to which project staff and other elementary school teachers were invited. In general, project sites provided staff training to which district elementary school staff were invited. In Oaks, OK, for example, elementary school teachers participated in the in-service training provided by the project, which helped remove the mystique from the early childhood program and enabled all the teachers to develop and work towards a common goal. In some projects, district funds supported some or all classroom teachers (e.g., Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; and Hidalgo, TX) and administrative personnel (Miami, FL; and Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; and Queens, NY).

Projects housed in school districts became an integral part of the school district's operations. Project directors generally reported to district bilingual supervisors or other administrators. In Brooklyn, NY, for example, the project director reported to the director of the district's Multilingual Center; whereas, in Miami, FL, the project manager reported to the director of curriculum and program development in the Division of Exceptional Student Education. This director, in turn, reported to the executive director of the Division of Exceptional Student Education.

Some projects also noted coordination with other Title VII projects in the district. Brooklyn, NY, for example, coordinated with the district's Two Way Bilingual Program (grades K-2), providing four years of bilingual education for participants. Hidalgo, TX, coordinated with the K-2 Transitional Program, providing bilingual services to children through second grade. The project director of the K-2 Transitional Program was the project director of the Special Populations Preschool project in its first year of operation. In Fremont, CA, this project was part of the district's prekindergarten through sixth grade developmental program of Spanish and English instruction.

Projects housed in elementary schools had access to all of the services, equipment, and facilities at the school. Children participated in schoolwide activities such as assemblies and ethnic festivals. School principals were responsible for the on-site supervision of the teaching staff; school nurses, counselors, and others, provided supportive services available to all children at the school. Child records were often transferred to the kindergarten teachers. In some cases, follow-up for preschool children entering kindergarten was provided through informal conversations between preschool and kindergarten teachers (e.g., Madera, CA, and Brooklyn, NY). In Seattle, WA, preschool teachers visited the kindergarten class during the year to observe project participants and hold a progress conference with the kindergarten teacher. In Fremont, CA, to ease the transition into first grade, the bilingual kindergartners joined the first graders at the end of the school year to listen to a first-grade teacher read a story.

Independent agencies. In projects that operate under the auspices of independent agencies, there is no inherent organizational link between the project and the local schools. In Kansas City, MO, the linkage was accomplished through the bilingual coordinator in the school district. She was the liaison between the school system and the project and helped coordinate training, organize standardized testing, and provide referrals to the program. In Kotzebue, AK, interaction with the local elementary school was also limited and revolved around record exchanges and attendance at in-service training provided by school districts. In St. Paul, MN, the project staff maintained ongoing communication with public school personnel and transferred child records to the kindergarten teachers. The district, in turn, provided the agency with health and special education language services. Good communication lines in Oklahoma City, OK, with public school teachers and principals facilitated the mainstreaming of preschool children into kindergarten.

The San Antonio, TX, project was in a unique position as it provided support services to four different school districts. In the two school districts that had Title VII programs, the project director worked closely with the Title VII coordinators. In one of these school districts, she had the strong support of the school superintendent, bilingual supervisor, and school principal. In the other, she had the strong support of the bilingual director and the district assistant superintendent. The school districts supported project efforts to provide training for parents by encouraging parents to attend the workshops and providing on-site child care. The parent workshops provided by the project complemented the workshops provided by each of the districts.

Community Linkages

Community linkages were most evident in projects operated by independent agencies. In both Kansas City, MO, and Kotzebue, AK, community involvement was an integral part of the program. The Kansas City, MO, project operated through a community center that offered a wide variety of programs for children and families. Support by community agencies and staff was evidenced by the following:

- Two businesses "adopted" the agency and helped with its physical upkeep and the purchase of supplies and equipment;
- Two local schools "adopted" the center's children;
- An Hispanic labor group provided resources and equipment;
- University of Kansas nursing students each visited the program for two days, observing and then presenting a lesson;
- As a means of community service, high school students helped in the classrooms or on field trips; and

- Eight individuals from South America who were students at a nearby college helped at the Center on an ongoing basis to learn English.

At the Kotzebue, AK, site, community involvement was important in recruiting children and promoting the program as well as the cultural values of the Inupiat people. The local elders were actively involved in promoting cultural survival and transmitting traditional Inupiat values and skills by providing input into the curriculum and working with the children twice a week at the Kotzebue Senior Citizens Cultural Center. The City of Kotzebue was responsible for handling the grant's finances and also leased a building for the project.

In projects operated by school districts, community involvement was more limited. At some sites, such as Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Hidalgo, TX, local businesses contributed to district-wide activities. In Miami, FL, organizations concerned with handicapped children made referrals to the district's special education program. Some school districts also relied on community agencies to provide workshops for teachers on safety and health-related issues.

Project Staff

Staffing Patterns

Staffing patterns varied across projects, but projects generally used a combination of teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, and specialists. (See Exhibit II-13, Staff Characteristics.) For the most part, staffing was not top-heavy; service delivery staff outnumbered administrators.

Administrators. At least one person -- a project director or coordinator -- had oversight in every project. In 10 sites (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA), the administrator was dedicated full time to the project; in only five projects were the coordinators or directors parttime (Madera, CA; Oaks, OK; Fillmore and Fremont, CA; and Queens, NY).

EXHIBIT II-13

Staff Characteristics

Project	Position					Characteristics			
						Teachers		Aides	
	Project Director and Other Project Administrators	Teacher	Aide	Specialist	Other	% Bilingual	% Minority	% Bilingual	% Minority
Second-Year Projects									
Madera, CA	Project Administrator (PT) Project Coordinator (PT)	88-90: 8(PT) 90-91: 7(PT)	88-90: 0 90-91: 1(PT)	Teacher Trainer (PT) Consultant Early Childhood Specialist	0	63%	63%	Not Available	Not Available
Miami, FL[1]	Project Director	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2 Bilingual Instructors 1 Haitian 1 Spanish	0	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Kansas City, MO	Project Director	3	3	0	0	100%	83%	100%	83%
Brooklyn, NY	Project Coordinator	2	2	2 Curriculum Resource Trainers	Secretary	100%	100%	100%	100%
Oaks, OK	Project Director (PT)	4	4	Parent Trainer (PT)	Office Manager	0%	50%	100%	100%
Hidalgo, TX	Project Director	88-89: 5 89-91: 6	88-89: 5 89-91: 6	2 Community Specialists Early Childhood Specialist Educational Psychologist/ Evaluator	Secretary	100%	100%	100%	100%

EXHIBIT II-13 (Continued)

Staff Characteristics

Project	Position					Characteristics			
						Teachers		Aides	
	Project Director and Other Project Administrators	Teacher	Aide	Specialist	Other	% Bilingual	% Minority	% Bilingual	% Minority
San Antonio, TX[1]	Project Director	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2 Education Specialists Materials Specialist	Secretary	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Third-Year Projects									
Kotzebue, AK	Project Director	3 Early Childhood Teachers	0	Project Coordinator Curriculum Developer/ Teacher Trainer	Administrative Assistant (PT)	0%	100%	0%	0%
Fillmore, CA[2]	Project Director (PT)	2	4 (PT)	Adult ESL Teacher (PT)	0	100%	100%	91%[2]	91%[2]
Fremont, CA	Project Director (PT)	2 (FT) 2 (PT)	4 (PT)	Bilingual Specialist (PT)	Secretary (PT)	75%	100%	100%	100%
St. Paul, MN	Project Director (PT) Academic Coordinator (PT)	1	1	0	0	100%	100%	100%	100%
Manhattan, NY	Director of Bilingual Programs Early Childhood Coordinator	3	2	School Neighbrohood Worker	0	100%	100%	100%	100%

---

[1] Staffing in this project did not include teachers and aides.

[2] Over the course of the project, there were 11 different aides. Ten were bilingual and minority.

EXHIBIT II-13 (Continued)

Staff Characteristics

	Position					Characteristics			
						Teachers		Aides	
Project	Project Director and Other Project Administrators	Teacher	Aide	Specialist	Other	% Bilingual	% Minority	% Bilingual	% Minority
Queens, NY	Bilingual Supervisor (PT)	2	2	Teacher Trainer (PT)	Office Associate (PT)	100%	100%	100%	100%
Oklahoma City, OK	Project Director	3 (PT)	1 (PT)	0	Transportation Operator	100%	100%	0%	0%
Seattle, WA	Project Coordinator District Bilingual Project Coordinator	1	87-89:2 89-90:2 1(PT)	0	87-89: Parent Coordinator/Clerk (PT)	100%	0%	100%	100%

Specialists. Most of the projects called upon the expertise of a trainer or specialist. Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; Kotzebue, AK; and Queens, NY, employed teacher trainers and Oaks, OK, used a parent trainer. Specialists in early childhood education (Madera, CA; Hidalgo, TX; and St. Paul, MN), bilingual (Fremont, CA), and bilingual preschool (Oklahoma City, OK), generally served as part-time staff on the projects. Curriculum and materials experts advised some projects (San Antonio, TX, and Kotzebue, AK). In Hidalgo, TX, and Manhattan, NY, community specialists served as liaisons between the project and the community. An educational psychologist/evaluator served as a consultant on program evaluation in Hidalgo, TX.

Instructional staff. Teachers and paraprofessionals provided instruction in most projects. However, in Madera, CA, and Kotzebue, AK, there were no paraprofessionals. In some projects, the roles of teacher and paraprofessional were not easily distinguished. For example, in Seattle, WA, the two paraprofessionals functioned as primary instructors with guidance from the lead teacher. The Miami, FL, project used two Bilingual Instructors to supplement instruction by regular classroom teachers. Classroom teachers and aides for the special education classes in Miami, FL, were staffed through the school district. In San Antonio, TX, the project focused on staff development, but the roles of teachers were not a part of the Title VII project.

Child/Staff Ratio

Classroom staffing patterns generally allowed for two staff for a class of children. With two exceptions (Madera, CA, and Kansas City, MO), these staff consisted of a teacher and an aide. The Madera, CA, project utilized a Spanish/English model of instruction and had two teachers in the classroom and no aide. The four-year-old class in Kansas City, MO, had a head teacher, two teachers, two aides, and two "abuelitas" (grandmothers).

In terms of child/staff ratios, the National Day Care Project recommended a ratio of seven children to one staff member. NAEYC supports a 10:1 ratio for four- and five-year-olds and a smaller ratio for three-year-olds. Five project sites (Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; and Hidalgo, TX) met the recommendations of NAEYC for child/staff ratios. With the exception of Hidalgo, TX, which had a 10:1 ratio, the other project sites averaged approximately a 7:1 or 8:1 ratio. Fremont, CA, was the only project site that did not meet the NAEYC recommendations, as it had a 12:1 ratio for the preschool classes.

Instructor Characteristics

Ability to speak the children's language. Most or all of the instructional staff were members of the same minority group as the children. Either teachers or paraprofessionals or both were able to speak the language of the children in most of the projects.[14] Kotzebue, AK, was the only project in which all of the instructors were monolingual English speakers. All of the instructional staff in nine projects (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan and Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA) spoke the children's native language. In Fillmore, CA, the teachers were bilingual, but not all of the paraprofessionals were bilingual. In Madera, CA, teachers modeled either Spanish or English; the Spanish models and one of the English models were fluent in Spanish. In Oaks, OK, the paraprofessionals could speak Cherokee while the teachers could not, while in Oklahoma City, OK, the teachers could speak Spanish and the paraprofessionals could not.

Several project directors stressed the difficulty of finding bilingual staff who are qualified to work with young children. The Oaks, OK, director resolved that dilemma by hiring staff with complementary qualifications: the paraprofessionals were bilingual and the teachers had early childhood teacher training.

Certification. Teachers were certified or credentialed in most of the projects. These credentials tended to be in the areas of early childhood education (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; San Antonio, TX; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK) or bilingual education (Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; and Queens, NY). In Kansas City, MO, and San Antonio, TX, many of the teachers lacked certification in early childhood education.

---

[14] Staff characteristics of the four school districts served by the San Antonio, TX, project were not available.

Training

Each project demonstrated a unique approach to staff development for its bilingual preschool instructors. Training could be limited to project staff or open to district staff. Depending on the categories of staff involved, the training could be provided by the project or district staff, local universities, or other outside consultants, and be financially supported by a number of sources. Finally, there was a broad range of training formats. The most common approaches were preservice sessions, in-service activities and workshops, conferences, and college or university courses.

Training participants. Training held in conjunction with the Title VII projects was often not limited to project staff. In Miami, FL, and Fillmore, CA, district teachers attended the training sessions; in Brooklyn, NY, project and district teachers and paraprofessionals were included in the workshops; and in Oaks, OK, project staff and district kindergarten and first-grade teachers were invited to participate. The St. Paul, MN, project, housed in a small private school, offered general workshops for the entire staff; often, the topics were not relevant to very young children.

Training provider. Most frequently, district staff, such as the bilingual or early childhood coordinators, conducted staff development sessions (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). In some programs (Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; St. Paul, MN; and Queens, NY), the project director or other project staff conducted the training. Consultants were another popular source of training expertise (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; St. Paul, MN; and Seattle, WA). Several projects used a combination of different training providers to conduct the workshops.

Funding source. Teacher training, whether offered to district staff or limited to project staff, was funded by or partially supplemented by district funds in 10 projects (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; Manhattan, NY; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). (See Exhibit II-14, Staff Development, 1989-90.) Title VII funds were used to finance or supplement training in all of the projects except St. Paul, MN, and Manhattan, NY. In several cases, the public school or independent agency (Kansas City, MO, and St. Paul, MN) or state grants (Brooklyn, NY, and Kotzebue, AK) paid for some staff training.

Types of Training Activities

Preservice sessions. Four projects (Madera, CA; Hidalgo, TX; Fillmore, CA; and Queens, NY), conducted annual preservice training in addition to training throughout the school year. The two-week preservice in Madera, CA, covered theoretical topics such as the dual language model and second language acquisition, and practical applications such as multicultural hands-on activities. The Hidalgo, TX, preservice topics included early childhood development, project philosophy and objectives, the whole language approach, curriculum development, classroom management, and paraprofessional roles and responsibilities. As was true for Madera, CA, some of the topics in Hidalgo, TX, were theoretical and some practical.

Inservice training sessions and workshops. Most staff development opportunities were provided in-service training sessions and workshops. Every project reviewed offered periodic or regular in-service sessions or workshops. Weekly workshops were conducted by the Madera, CA; Kotzebue, AK; and Oklahoma City, OK, projects; monthly training activities were provided by the Brooklyn, NY; Fillmore, CA; and Manhattan, NY, projects. Ten projects (Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; St. Paul, MN; Manhattan, NY; and Seattle, WA), conducted between one and 20 workshops per year.

EXHIBIT II-14

Staff Development, 1989-90

Project	Types				Key Topics		Frequency (Per Year)			Funding Source		
	Pre-Service	Work-shop/In Service	Confer-ence	Course	Bilingual	Early Child-hood	1-20	21-40	Over 40	Title VII	District	Other
Second-Year Projects												
Madera, CA	X	X			X			X		X	X	
Miami, FL		X			X	X	X			X		
Kansas City, MO		X					X			X		X
Brooklyn, NY		X			X	X	X			X	X	X
Oaks, OK		X			X		X			X	X	
Hidalgo, TX	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X
San Antonio, TX		X	X		X	X	X			X	X	
Third-Year Projects												
Kotzebue, AK		X	X			X			X	X	X	X
Fillmore, CA	X	X					X			X	X	
Fremont, CA		X			X		X			X	X	
St. Paul, MN		X					X					X
Manhattan, NY		X					X				X	
Queens, NY	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	
Oklahoma City, OK		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Seattle, WA		X				X	X			X	X	
Totals												
Number	4	15	3	3	9	8	10	4	1	13	10	5
Percent	27%	100%	20%	20%	75%	53%	67%	27%	6%	87%	67%	33%

Four projects (Madera, CA; Hidalgo, TX; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), held between 21 and 40 workshops per year.

The in-service activities and workshops generally concentrated on early childhood and bilingual topics. Early childhood development and a multicultural approach to early childhood education were the focus of in-service activities and workshops provided by seven projects (Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). Nine projects (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; San Antonio, TX; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), conducted training on bilingual topics such as activities, games, and learning centers for the bilingual classroom; the whole language, dual language, and sheltered English approaches; ESL theory and second language acquisition; and bilingual preschool program models including High/Scope and Alerta. However, topics were not limited to early childhood and bilingual education; they ranged from AIDS education to child abuse.

Conferences. In three projects (San Antonio, TX; Kotzebue, AK; and Oklahoma City, OK), the teachers were sponsored to attend state-level conferences on relevant topics. Three conferences in Texas, provided by professional associations, covered bilingual education and early childhood topics. The San Antonio, TX, project provided teachers a stipend for attending the conferences. Teachers from the Kotzebue, AK, program attended an annual three-day conference on early childhood.

Courses. Teachers at three sites (Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK) and paraprofessionals at one site (Hidalgo, TX), were strongly encouraged to take classes at nearby universities. For example, at the Queens, NY, project, teachers studied teaching through bilingual and ESL methods and materials. College credit courses were provided to Oaks, OK, teachers at the school site by university professors. Both the Oaks, OK, and the Fremont, CA, projects ensured a constant supply of qualified teachers and paraprofessionals by encouraging previous children and participants' parents to earn the college credits necessary to work with the projects. While this encouragement was unofficial and unfinanced, it was instrumental in producing qualified teachers. In five of the projects (Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Fremont, CA; Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), coursework was applicable to certification.

On-site assistance. On-site assistance was provided to the four school districts participating in the San Antonio project. Project staff visited each of the 23 teachers approximately five times during the course of the school year. The observations focused on all aspects of instruction and were followed by post-observation conferences in which recommendations were made regarding teaching strategies.

Field visits. Teachers participating in the San Antonio, TX, project visited model early childhood programs to observe developmentally appropriate activities and learning centers in operation.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Evaluation reports were available for 11 of the 15 second- and third-year projects under review. Three third-year projects did not have such reports in their files at the Department of Education or at the project offices, although evaluations had been done (Fillmore, CA; Fremont, CA; and St. Paul, MN). The evaluation of the San Antonio, TX, project did not discuss participant progress, as this project was under contract to train teachers and develop materials. In consequence, this review concerns 11 projects--those for whom evaluation data were accessible.

Because each project selected its own evaluator and designed its own evaluation, the measurement of children's progress differed. (See Exhibit II-15, Evaluation of Participant

EXHIBIT II-15

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Second-Year Projects								
Madera, CA	ABC Inventory	Draw a man	89-90	15	Mean difference of 15.7 on 68-point scale	46.1	-	-
		Answer language questions	89-90	15	Mean difference of 6.4 on 32-point scale	22.3	-	-
		Answer cognitive questions	89-90	15	Mean difference of 1.7 on 12-point scale	7.5	-	-
		Motor activity tasks	89-90	15	Mean difference of 9.7 on 32-point scale	21.9	-	-
	Individual Assessment File	Social development	89-90	57	-	18.0 on 30-point scale	-	-
		Physical development	89-90	57	-	19.6 on 30-point scale	-	-
		Intellectual development	89-90	57	-	15.3 on 30-point scale	-	-
		Language development-English	89-90	57	-	12.5 on 30-point scale	-	-
		Language development-Spanish	89-90	57	-	11.4 on 30-point scale	-	-
	Bilingual Syntax Measure	English	89-90	62	-	2.5 on 5-point scale	-	-
		Spanish	89-90	68	-	2.2 on 5-point scale	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Miami, FL	Pre-Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test	English	88-89	30	Mean difference of 5.2 on 42-point scale	18.2**	-	-
	Exceptional Student Progress Report	Reading readiness	88-89	30	-	1.8 on 8-point scale	-	-
		Math readiness	88-89	30	-	1.5 on 8-point scale	-	-
		Social/self-help	88-89	30	-	.9 on 8-point scale	-	-
Kansas City, MO[1]	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	NA						
	Denver Developmental Screening Test	NA						
	Master Checklists	Language development	88-89	52	-	69% mastered 16 skills	-	-
		Social and personal skills	88-89	67	-	63% mastered 22 skills	-	-
		Fine and gross motor skills	88-89	73	-	53% mastered 32 skills	-	-
Brooklyn, NY	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	88-89	30	Mean difference of 1.8 on 5-point scale	3.1*	1.8*** (another district bilingual program, N=30)	Mean difference of .1
		Spanish language skills	88-89	30	Mean difference of 2.3 on 5-point scale	4.1*	1.9***	Mean difference of .1

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Miami, Fl.	Pre-Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test	English	88-89	30	Mean difference of 5.2 on 42-point scale	18.2**	-	-
	Exceptional Student Progress Report	Reading readiness	88-89	30	-	1.8 on 8-point scale	-	-
		Math readiness	88-89	30	-	1.5 on 8-point scale	-	-
		Social/self-help	88-89	30	-	.9 on 8-point scale	-	-
Kansas City, MO[1]	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	NA						
	Denver Developmental Screening Test	NA						
	Master Checklists	Language development	88-89	52	-	69% mastered 16 skills	-	-
		Social and personal skills	88-89	67	-	63% mastered 22 skills	-	-
		Fine and gross motor skills	88-89	73	-	53% mastered 32 skills	-	-
Brooklyn, NY	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	88-89	30	Mean difference of 1.8 on 5-point scale	3.1*	1.8*** (another district bilingual program, N=30)	Mean difference of .1
		Spanish language skills	88-89	30	Mean difference of 2.3 on 5-point scale	4.1*	1.9***	Mean difference of .1

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Oaks, OK (Cont.)	Miller Assessment for Preschoolers (Cont.)	Foundations	89-90	59	Mean difference of 17.1 NCE on 100-point scale	51.5***	-	-
		Coordination	89-90	59	Mean difference of 20.9 NCE on 100-point scale	48.8***	-	-
		Verbal	89-90	59	Mean difference of 16.7 NCE on 100-point scale	46.2***	-	-
		Non-verbal	89-90	59	Mean difference of 9.6 NCE on 100-point scale	49.9***	-	-
		Complex tasks	89-90	59	Mean difference of 10.8 NCE on 100-point scale	43.0***	-	-
Hidalgo, TX[1]	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	89-90	86	Mean difference of .5 on 5-point scale	2.0	-	-
		Spanish language skills	89-90	87	Mean difference of .6 on 5-point scale	4.1	-	-
	Cooperative Preschool Inventory	School readiness: English	89-90	76	Mean difference of 22.1 on 64-point scale	34.8	-	-
		School readiness: Spanish	89-90	75	Mean difference of 17.9 on 64-point scale	50.0	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Third-Year Projects								
Kotzebue, AK[1]	Inupiat Ilitqusiat English Language Checklist	Oral language	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Comprehension	88-89	17	94% increased a least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Interest level	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Cultural awareness	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Interaction with children	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Interaction with adults	88-89	17	88% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Gross motor	88-89	17	88% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Fine motor	88-89	17	88% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
		Self-esteem	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Kotzebue, AK (Cont.)	Inupiat Ilitqusiat English Language Checklist (Cont.)	Awareness of feelings	88-89	17	94% increased at least 1 point on 4-point scale	3 to 4	-	-
	Brigance Preschool Screen (using norms for three-year-olds)	Personal data response (informal language)	88-89	17	Mean difference of 2.3 on 6-point scale	4.7	-	-
		Identify body parts	88-89	17	Mean difference of 3.2 on 9-point scale	8.8	-	-
		Identify objects	88-89	17	Mean difference of 4.6 on 9-point scale	8.8	-	-
		Repeat sentences	88-89	17	Mean difference of 5.2 on 9-point scale	8.1	-	-
		Picture vocabulary	88-89	17	Mean difference of 2.8 on 10-point scale	9.3	-	-
		Plurals and -ings	88-89	17	Mean difference of 3.6 on a 10-point scale	9.7	-	-
		Gross motor skills	88-89	17	Mean difference of 6.1 on 9-point scale	8.6	-	-
		Visual motor skills	88-89	17	Mean difference of 4.2 on 9-point scale	8.1	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Kotzebue, AK (Cont.)	Brigance Preschool Screen (using norms for three-year-olds) (Cont.)	Builds tower with blocks	88-89	17	Mean difference of 1.4 on 10-point scale	10.0	-	-
		Matches colors	88-89	17	Mean difference of 1.8 on 10-point scale	9.8	-	-
		Number concepts	88-89	17	Mean difference of 1.9 on 9-point scale	9.0	-	-
Fillmore, CA	NA							
Fremont, CA	NA							
St. Paul, MN	NA							
Manhattan, NY[1]	Developmental Checklists	Personal and social development	87-88	30	-	At least 90% passed 15 of 16 items	-	-
		Physical development	87-88	30	-	At least 90% passed 15 of 16 items	-	-
		Intellectual development	87-88	30	-	At least 90% passed all 23 items	-	-
		Use of other languages	87-88	30	-	At least 90% passed all 6 items	-	-
		Creative expression	87-88	30	-	At least 90% passed all 7 items	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Queens, NY	Basic Inventory of Natural Languages	English oral proficiency	88-89	25	Mean difference of 27.5 on 100-point scale for Greek classes	40.8**	-	-
			88-89	42	Mean difference of 23.3 for Spanish classes	34.5**	-	-
	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	88-89	25	Mean difference of .6 on 5-point scale for Greek classes	1.8**	-	-
			88-89	42	Mean difference of .6 for Spanish classes	1.8**	-	-
Oklahoma City, OK[1]	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	89-90	23	Mean difference of .9 on 5-point scale	2.5	-	-
	Developmental Checklists	English language skills	89-90	24	Mean difference of 6.3 on 12-point scale	8.0	-	-
		Intellectual skills	89-90	24	Mean difference of 5.7 on 10-point scale	6.0	-	-
		Societal arts and skills	89-90	24	Mean difference of 4.4 on 10-point scale	5.5	-	-

EXHIBIT II-15 (Continued)

Evaluation of Participant Progress

Project	Name of Test	Subscale	Year	No. of Children	Gains Across Year	Mean Post-Test Score	Mean Post-Test Score of Comparison Group	Gains of Comparison Group
Seattle, WA[1]	Preschool Language Assessment Scales	English language skills	88-89	21	Mean difference of 1.5 on 5-point scale	2.4	-	-
	Metropolitian Readiness Tests	School readiness	88-89	NA				

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

[1] No tests of significance were performed by the evaluators at this site.

Progress.) Some projects used standardized tests for measuring progress. The following tests were used by the sites listed:

- ABC Inventory (Madera, CA);
- Bilingual Syntax Measure (Madera, CA);
- Pre-Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test (Miami, FL);
- Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Kansas City, MO; Brooklyn, NY; Hidalgo, TX; Queens, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA);
- Denver Developmental Screening Test (Kansas City, MO);
- Test of Early Language Development (Oaks, OK);
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Oaks, OK);
- Missouri Kids Test (Oaks, OK);
- Miller Assessment for Preschoolers (Oaks, OK);
- Cooperative Preschool Inventory (Hidalgo, TX);
- Brigance Preschool Screen (Kotzebue, AK);
- Basic Inventory of Natural Languages (Queens, NY); and
- Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Seattle, WA).

It is interesting to note that most of these tests were used at only one site; only the Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS) were used at multiple sites.

At times standardized tests were the only measures of progress (Brooklyn, NY; Oaks, OK; Hidalgo, TX; Queens, NY; and Seattle, WA). At other times the use of one or more standardized tests was combined with the use of locally designed instruments (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Kotzebue, AK; and Oklahoma City, OK). In one site (Manhattan, NY) a locally designed instrument was the sole measure of progress.

The measures of participant progress also varied in the sorts of abilities they measured. Every site used some measure of language skill, since a central purpose of the Special Populations Preschool grants was to support language development in children. But many sites also chose to evaluate intellectual/cognitive skills (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA), social/emotional skills (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Kansas City, MO; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK), and fine and gross motor skills (Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; and Manhattan, NY).

In addition, the results that were reported by evaluators differed and sometimes created problems in interpretation. Data were presented in one or more of four ways:

(1) The size of the gain in bilingual preschool children's scores from pre- to post-test, either in terms of the difference in the means of pre- and post-test scores or in terms of the percent of children who gained at least a stated number of points;

(2) The mean post-test score of children in the bilingual preschool program;

(3) The mean post-test score of children in another program (a comparison group); or

(4) The size of the gain in comparison group children's scores from pre- to post-test.

It was difficult to understand the meaning of many of the findings and to compare results across differing formats. For example, the Kotzebue, AK, project reported results such as "94 percent of the children increased at least one point on a four-point scale." Manhattan, NY, evaluators stated results in phrases such as "at least 90 percent passed 15 of 16 items." We have no idea if a difference of one point on the Kotzebue measures is meaningful in a statistical sense or in an educational sense. Does one point represent a limited or a substantial amount of learning? Similarly, we cannot judge the relevance of passing 15 of 16 items in Manhattan: Are all items of equal importance? Where did the other 10 percent of children score?

The following additional limitations must be noted:

- The sample sizes are often small in absolute size (i.e., Madera, CA, 15 on ABC Inventory; Kotzebue, AK, 17 on all tests; Oklahoma City, OK, 23 or 24; and Seattle, WA, 21) and, in some cases, represent 50 percent or less of the children in the program (i.e., Madera, CA, 20 percent given ABC Inventory; Brooklyn, NY, 50 percent given Pre-LAS; and Oklahoma City, OK, 32 percent given Pre-LAS and 33 percent given Developmental Checklists).

- No project included a true "control" group.

That is, no project randomly assigned children to "treatment" versus "no treatment" groups and contrasted the results. At least in part this was probably due to a desire on the part of school systems to provide services to all children in need, whether services were in the bilingual projects funded by these grants or by other sources. The one project (Brooklyn, NY) in which evaluators compared Special Populations-funded children with another group did not include random assignment of children to the programs, and the two groups of children differed in skill in English at the beginning of the project year. That is, the evaluators used a "comparison" group, but not a "control" group, and because of the initial differences in skill level, it is difficult to compare the gains achieved.

Finally, the lack of testing for statistical significance led to difficulties in interpretation of the results. The evaluators of seven projects did not perform any such tests: Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA. Especially in the cases of locally designed tests, we cannot judge the significance of the post-test scores or the gains across the year.

However, with these caveats in mind, a review of the column on Exhibit II-15 concerning gains of children in the bilingual preschool projects appears at least encouraging. On every single measure listed by each project the children showed positive gain scores. Some of the changes seem quite large:

- Children in the Kotzebue, AK, program gained so many points on several subscales of the Brigance Preschool Screen (identify body parts, identify objects, plurals and -ings, builds tower with blocks, matches colors, and number concepts) that they virtually reached its ceiling.[15]

Several changes were judged by evaluators as statistically significant.[16] For example, the differences between pre- and post-test means of children at the following sites were significant:

- Miami, FL: Gains on the Pre-Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test (Pre-IPT) were significant at the $p<.001$ level;
- Oaks, OK: Gains on the Test of Early Language Development (TELD), the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), the Missouri Kids Test (all subscales), and the Miller Assessment for Preschoolers (total and all subscales) were significant at levels ranging from .05 to .001; and
- Queens, NY: Gains on the Basic Inventory of Natural Languages (BINL) and the Pre-LAS were significant at the $p<.01$ level.

The problem with these positive reports is in their interpretation. We expect every preschool-aged child to change or develop or make gains in the course of six months to a year. It would be very surprising if there were no differences between pre- and post-test scores. To be able to judge whether the gains shown by children are meaningful (due to the project), we need additional information. One way to judge the gains is to compare those made by children in the Special Populations Preschool project with those not in such a project. A second is to examine the post-test scores of children in the project in comparison with some "absolute" measure such as the level of English proficiency defined on the Pre-LAS by the children's mean score.

In the following two sections, we summarize participant progress in language development and in other areas of development using these two approaches. Since Brooklyn, NY, is the only site with test scores for a comparison group, most of the data cited refer to post-test scores.

---

[15] There is a potential problem with these results in that the post-test scores are interpreted using norms for three-year-olds. On the one hand, this is a program for three-year-olds, so the norms used may have been correctly chosen. On the other hand, many of the children may have turned four by the end of the year. In the absence of data on exact ages, it is not possible to say whether the norms used were correct or not.

[16] Please note that the lack of an asterisk on Exhibit II-15 does not necessarily mean a lack of statistical significance. Rather, in Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; Kotzebue, AK; Manhattan, NY; Oklahoma City, OK; and Seattle, WA, it means that the evaluators did not perform any tests of significance.

Results Concerning Language Development

Exhibit II-16, Progress in Language Skills as Measured by Standardized Tests, summarizes the results of standardized measures of language development in children. In addition to citing the name of the test used, it provides information on the mean scores achieved by children in the project on tests of English and Spanish proficiency (tests were not given in other native languages) and converts these "raw" scores to either a percent correct or a rating of the language proficiency represented by the score. Note that only nine projects are represented on the table. Two of the 11 projects for whom evaluation reports on participant progress were available could not be included, one because it used only locally designed measures (Manhattan, NY), and the other because evaluators reported scores on standardized tests in a manner that was not usable (Kansas City, MO). Specifically, the evaluators of the Kansas City project reported the number and percent of children who scored at or above age/grade level but did not cite actual scores.

Results on English language proficiency measured by the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM) and the Pre-LAS have similar interpretations. Each generates a score from 1 to 5 to represent a child's language ability. An individual scoring 1 to 2 is designated as a non-English speaker; a person scoring 3 is a limited English speaker; a child scoring 4 to 5 is an English speaker. For the six sites using this scoring system, the mean post-test score of children ranged from 1.8 (Queens, NY), to 3.1 (Brooklyn, NY). In general, at the end of a year in the program, children were "non-English speakers" to "limited English speakers."

In terms of progress for children on other tests of language proficiency, findings are available for four sites (Miami, FL; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; and Queens, NY), but are hard to

EXHIBIT II-16

Progress in Language Skills as Measured by Standardized Tests

Project	Name of Test	Post-test Score: English		Post-test Score: Spanish	
		Raw Score	% Correct or Rating	Raw Score	% Correct or Rating
Second-Year Projects					
Madera, CA	Bilingual Syntax Measure	2.5/5	non- to limited English speaker	2.2/5	non- to limited English speaker
Miami, FL	Pre-Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test	18.2/42	43%		
Brooklyn, NY	Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS)	67.9/100	68%	78.1/100	78%
Oaks, OK	Test of Early Language Development Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Missouri Kids - Language - Verbal Concepts Miller Assessment for Preschoolers - Verbal	41.7/100 33.9/100 46.7/100 47.1/100 46.2/100	42% 34% 47% 47% 46%		
Hidalgo, TX	Pre-LAS Cooperative Preschool Inventory	2.0/5 34.8/64	non-English speaker 54%	4.1/5 50/64	Spanish speaker 78%
Third-Year Projects					
Kotzebue, AK	Brigance Preschool Screen - Personal Data - Body Parts - Objects - Sentences - Picture Vocabulary - Plurals and -ings	4.7/6 8.8/9 8.8/9 8.1/9 9.3/10 9.7/10	78% 98% 98% 90% 93% 97%		
Queens, NY	Basic Inventory of Natural Languages Pre-LAS	40.8/100 Greek 34.5/100 Hispanic 1.8/5 Greek 1.8/5 Spanish	41% 35% non-English speaker non-English speaker		
Oklahoma City, OK	Pre-LAS	2.5/5	non- to limited English speaker		
Seattle, WA	Pre-LAS	2.4/5	non- to limited English speaker		

interpret. The percent of items correct at the end of the project year varied from 35 percent (Queens, NY, Basic Inventory of Natural Languages) to 43 percent (Miami, FL, Pre-Idea) to over 90 percent (Kotzebue, AK, Brigance Preschool Screen). But the results in Kotzebue, AK, may not be meaningful: these children spoke a version of English (influenced by Inupiaq) when they entered the project and may, thus, have been ahead of the "non-English speakers" in other projects. If we omit Kotzebue, AK, then children correctly answered from 35 to 43 percent. But how do scores of this magnitude convert to fluency in English? It is not possible, with these limited data, to say exactly how proficient in English these children were at the end of their projects.

The data from Oaks, while not given a "rating" on the exhibit, suggest a relatively strong performance on several tests of language skill. Finding a low-income group scoring between 41.7 and 47.1 NCE is encouraging, since they are within one standard deviation of the mean (50 NCE) for all children in their age group.

The results for the one project that used a comparison group (Brooklyn, NY) suggest that the children in the Special Populations Preschool project improved significantly more than children in another district bilingual program. Children in the comparison group gained an average of .1 points on the Pre-LAS while Special Populations Preschool children gained 1.8 points. Comparison group children started the year with significantly higher scores on the Pre-LAS than Special Populations Preschool children, but did not improve to the same degree, and ended the year at a lower level of proficiency.

Thus, we can tentatively conclude that children improve in English language skills over the course of their time in the Special Populations Preschool project. In one project, they improved significantly more than a comparison group of children. However, most of the children still ended the year as non-English speakers.

This relatively low proficiency in English achieved by children is an important focus for the Special Populations Preschool project as a whole. Its significance is difficult to interpret. On the one hand, it does represent progress. Many of the children in these projects had no experience with English prior to preschool. One may see their development from no English to "some" English as a reasonable amount of learning. On the other hand, post-test scores show that many children are still "non-English speakers," and the results (without true control groups) do not permit us to distinguish between program effects and the natural increases that would occur without the program. Defining the degree of gains that can be expected and the end-point to which projects should aim is important for all concerned with this effort.

Only three projects (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Hidalgo, TX), measured skills in the child's native language, and in all three projects that native language was Spanish. Children in two sites (Brooklyn, NY, and Hidalgo, TX), made considerable gains in their knowledge of Spanish (Exhibit II-15) and qualified as "Spanish speakers" at the end of the year (Exhibit II-16). But children in Madera, CA, did not seem as capable. At the end of the year they averaged a score of 2.2 on the BSM, between the score of two (non-Spanish speaker) and three (limited Spanish speaker). It is not clear why their abilities in their native language were this low. It may be that this group of migrant children did not react well to the testing situation.

Results Concerning Other Skills

Interpretation of the findings on children's progress in the areas of intellectual/cognitive skills, social/emotional/self-help skills, and gross and fine motor skills is difficult. First, although a child's response to questions on tests of these skills may be oral or pointing or motor, the questions are generally presented to the child orally. In the instances of use of these tests with project children, most were given in English. Consequently, a change in the child's response from pre- to post-test may represent a measure of change in his/her ability to understand the questions, rather than a change in the skill supposedly being required. Second, early childhood educators stress that development should not be isolated into separate domains because a lag in one domain (e.g., language) has implications for development in other domains. Third, interpretation of scores is complicated by the fact that no two sites used the same standardized tests; most sites used locally designed instruments. Of the five sites that used standardized tests of any of these skills (Madera, CA; Kansas City, MO; Oaks, OK; Kotzebue, AK; and Seattle, WA), two did not report scores (Kansas City, MO, and Seattle, WA). In the three sites that did report scores, the subscales did not measure the same phenomena and the scores are in different metrics:

- Madera, CA:
  - ABC Inventory-Draw a man, mean post-test score, 46.1 on 68-point scale;
  - ABC Inventory-Cognitive questions, mean post-test score, 7.5 on 12-point scale;
  - ABC Inventory-Motor activities, mean post-test score, 21.9 on 32-point scale;
- Oaks, OK:
  - Missouri Kids-Number concepts, 49.3 NCEs;
  - Missouri Kids-Paper/pencil, 51.5 NCEs;[17]
  - Missouri Kids-Audio/visual, 54.5 NCEs;[17]
  - Missouri Kids-Gross motor, 86.1 NCEs;
  - Miller Assessment for Preschoolers-Foundations, 43.0 NCEs;[17]
  - Miller Assessment for Preschoolers-Complex tasks, 43.0 NCEs;
  - Miller Assessment for Preschoolers-Coordination, 48.8 NCEs;[18]
- Kotzebue, AK:
  - Brigance Preschool Screen-Match colors, mean post-test score, 9.8 on 10-point scale;
  - Brigance Preschool Screen-Number concepts, mean post-test score of 9.0 on 9-point scale;
  - Brigance Preschool Screen-Gross motor, mean post-test score, 8.6 on 9-point scale;
  - Brigance Preschool Screen-Visual motor, mean post-test score, 8.1 on 9-point scale; and

---

[17] The nature of the items on this subscale is not known; they may be correctly placed as intellectual/cognitive or they may not.

[18] The nature of the items on this subscale is not known; they may be correctly placed as intellectual/cognitive or they may not.

Brigance Preschool Screen-Builds tower, mean post-test score of 10.0 on 10-point scale.

Overall, it is difficult to make any sorts of conclusions about the development of these non-language skills. We do not have comparable data across sites and cannot use locally defined checklists to make conclusions. As was true for the language scales, the scores that are reported by project evaluators suggest that children made progress in the course of their year in the project. But it is hard to tell if the level of progress was due to the project or was any greater than the progress they would have made at home or in another project.

Kindergarten Enrollment

Exhibit II-17, Kindergarten Enrollment, summarizes the available information on the kindergarten enrollment of graduates of the Title VII projects. In most of the school systems, children and families did not have a choice of kindergarten program:

- In Miami, FL; Kotzebue, AK; and Manhattan, NY, all children were placed in mainstreamed classrooms;
- In two of three schools served by the Madera, CA, project, one of two schools served by the Queens, NY, project, and the schools served in Oaks, OK, and Fremont, CA, all children were placed in a bilingual kindergarten.

In Oaks, OK, the bilingual kindergarten is a part of the Special Populations Preschool project, sharing facilities, materials, and equipment. The changing of school buildings occurs when children enter first grade.

When a choice of enrollment was offered, it was most often a choice between a bilingual and a mainstreamed kindergarten classroom (one of three schools in Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and St. Paul, MN; one of two schools in Queens, NY; and Oklahoma City, OK). In Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Queens, NY, children passed a screening test to be included in the mainstreamed classrooms. From the 1988-89 bilingual preschool class with a choice in Madera, CA, two of 16 children (13 percent of that group) entered the mainstreamed kindergarten, but

EXHIBIT II-17

Kindergarten Enrollment

Project	Years	Percent Mainstreamed	Percent ESL	Percent Bilingual	Comments
Second-Year Projects					
Madera, CA	89-90	3%		97%	Two schools place all children in bilingual kindergarten class. A third school places some children in bilingual classes and some in mainstreamed classes, depending on language ability and space.
Miami, FL	89-90	100%			N.B.: 64% are in Exceptional Special Education classes (conducted in English); 36% in regular kindergarten; 14% receive English for speakers of other languages instruction.
Kansas City, MO	All years	NA			
Brooklyn, NY	88-89 89-90	22% 11%		78% 89%	In 1989-90, 36% of the children placed in bilingual classes were placed in the Spanish-dominant class of the state funded Two Way Bilingual Program which runs through second grade.
Oaks, OK	All years			100%	The bilingual kindergarten is part of this project; all children then attend a mainstreamed first grade.
Hidalgo, TX	88-89 89-90		21% 22%	79% 78%	
Third-Year Projects					
Kotzebue, AK	All years	100%			Bilingual program not available.
Fillmore, CA	All years	NA			
Fremont, CA	All years			100%	Preschool is part of bilingual program through Grade 6.
St. Paul, MN	87-88 88-89 89-90	11% 10% 20%		89% 90% 80%	School goal is to develop Indian language skills. Bilingual program is not remedial.
Manhattan, NY	All years	100%			Bilingual program not available.
Queens, NY	87-88 88-89	25% Hispanic 25% Hispanic	75% Hispanic 75% Hispanic	100% Greek 100% Greek	Bilingual program not available in school for Spanish-speaking students. Bilingual program for Greek-speaking students considered enrichment program.
Oklahoma City, OK	87-88 88-89 89-90	97% 98% 100%		3% 2% 0%	Bilingual program has extended day program needed by working parents.
Seattle, WA	87-88 88-89	20% 19%	80% 81%		To be mainstreamed, must score above 3 on Pre-LAS and above 83 on MRT.

this was largely because the afternoon bilingual class was full. From the 1988-89 Special Populations preschool group in Brooklyn, NY, 22 percent of the children entered a mainstreamed elementary school classroom; from the 1989-90 preschool, 11 percent went on to a mainstreamed environment. In both of the years for which data are available in Queens, NY, 25 percent of the Hispanic children qualified for a mainstreamed kindergarten. Thus, where testing was done, a percentage ranging from 10 to 25 seemed to qualify for mainstreaming. In St. Paul, parental choice was used to decide placement, and from 10 to 20 percent of children from the bilingual preschool enrolled in a mainstreamed kindergarten. In Oklahoma City, OK, where spaces in a bilingual kindergarten were limited, 97 to 100 percent of the bilingual preschool graduates were placed in a mainstreamed environment.

The other school systems with a choice offered different options. Hidalgo, TX, provided both an ESL and a bilingual kindergarten. Twenty-one percent of children who attended the preschool project in 1988-89 and 22 percent of children who attended preschool in 1989-90 entered the ESL kindergarten. Seattle, WA, either assigned children to a mainstreamed or an ESL kindergarten. Nineteen to 20 percent of children were enrolled in the mainstreamed classes, depending on the year.

Thus, in only five of the 13 school systems considered here were kindergarten placements made on the basis of choice or qualification on a screening test. English language skill seems to have less to do with placement than the availability of bilingual or ESL classroom environments. In each school system where a choice was available, a relatively small percentage of children from the bilingual preschool project either choose or qualified for the mainstreamed environment. This seems compatible with the post-test scores of children on tests of English language proficiency, showing that relatively few were fluent English speakers at the end of the preschool program.

Follow-up Evaluations

Nearly every school system that enrolls graduates of a bilingual preschool program engages in standardized testing of students. Unfortunately, we were unable to acquire the scores from this testing for most of the projects. (See Exhibit II-18, Follow-up Assessments.) The evidence that we accumulated suggests that children from the Special Populations Preschool projects were ahead of children who did not have such a program, but this evidence is not generally gleaned from test scores. Rather, it is from the interviews done at each project with kindergarten and first-grade teachers about the project graduates that they are now teaching.

For example, in Oaks, OK, the first-grade teachers reported that the children who were enrolled in this project were better prepared, more receptive, more aware of the rules of the classroom, more comfortable playing with others, and more talkative than the children from several years ago who did not benefit from this project. The kindergarten teachers in Brooklyn, NY, reported that children from the bilingual preschool project were more able to assimilate what they were learning, had better eye-hand coordination, knew their shapes, followed directions better, spoke more, and were more self-confident than children who did not participate in the project. In Miami, FL, teachers of the exceptional children who have completed the bilingual preschool project said that the learning rate of these children was higher, they knew more concepts, understood directions, and had no problems interacting with others. In Fillmore, CA, the teachers reported that the bilingual preschool graduates were "class leaders." Similar observations were reported in Madera, CA, and Oklahoma City, OK.

The only relating of test scores was done in Hidalgo, TX. As reported by school district staff, children who had enrolled in the bilingual preschool project showed greater oral English proficiency in kindergarten on the IDEA Oral Proficiency Test (a mean of 2.2 versus 1.6) and greater reading proficiency on an English Reading Index (a mean of 4.1 versus 2.7) than children

EXHIBIT II-18

Follow-up Assessments

Project	Assessment Method	Subscales	Findings
Second-Year Projects			
Madera, CA	NA		
Miami, FL	NA		
Kansas City, MO	NA		
Brooklyn, NY	NA		
Oaks, OK	Metropolitan Achievement Test Stanford Achievement Test	Variety of school subjects Variety of school subjects	NA NA
Hidalgo, TX	IDEA Oral Proficiency Test District-developed Spanish Reading Test District-developed English Reading Test	English proficiency	Mean of 2.2 vs. control group mean of 1.6 Mean of 3.9 vs. control's 3.7 Mean of 4.1 vs. control's 2.7
Third-Year Projects			
Kotzebue, AK	NA		
Fillmore, CA	NA		
Fremont, CA	Informal review of annual California Test of Basic Skills scores		NA
St. Paul, MN	NA		
Manhattan, NY	Language Assessment Battery School screening: Physical development Gross and fine motor development Receptive language development Expressive language development Cognitive language development Articulation skills	English proficiency	NA
Queens, NY	Language Assessment Battery	English proficiency	NA
Oklahoma City, OK	Brigance Battery of Kindergarten Readiness Iowa Test of Basic Skills	School readiness Variety of school subjects	NA
Seattle, WA	Metropolitan Readiness Tests Teacher evaluation forms	School readiness	NA

not in the project. Unfortunately, these reported scores are not in the usual form of scores onthe IDEA where levels are indicated by A to F and M. It is not clear what the numbers represent or how to interpret them. So, we have little "hard" evidence of the success of the project over the long term. However, the reports of elementary school staff suggest that children in the project have learned important school readiness skills.

Fiscal Operations

1989-90 Budgets

Exhibit II-19, 1989-90 Budget Data, shows both the amount of money allocated per grantee and the number of children served by the project. In three instances, the number of children served included kindergarten children (Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; and Fremont, CA), but in each case (except San Antonio, TX), the services for this older group were limited and the services paid for by the grant were much more extensive for the prekindergarten children. For the present analysis, we have considered the number served to be the number of preschool-aged children: 32 for Oaks, OK; 363 for San Antonio, TX; and 50 for Fremont, CA.

The total dollar amounts allotted to second- and third-year grantees in 1989-90 ranged from $57,919 provided to Oklahoma City, OK, in 1989-90 to the $304,421 allotted to Brooklyn, NY. Since projects served different numbers of children and provided somewhat different services, however, it is important to examine costs per child and costs related to services provided.

The budgeted costs per preschool child (from lowest to highest) were as follows:

San Antonio, TX	$ 619
Oklahoma City, OK	706
Fremont, CA	970
Madera, CA	1,296
Hidalgo, TX	1,439
Fillmore, CA	1,484
Kansas City, MO	1,564
Seattle, WA	2,416
St. Paul, MN	2,680
Queens, NY	3,250
Kotzebue, AK	4,560
Brooklyn, NY	5,074

EXHIBIT II-19

1989-90 Budget Data

Project	Grant Amount	Preschool Enrollment	Grant Amount Per Preschool Child	Grant as Percent of Total Budget
Second-Year Projects				
Madera, CA	$98,469	76	$1,296	77%
Miami, FL	152,000	29	5,241	Not available
Kansas City, MO	85,997	55	1,564	35%
Brooklyn, NY	304,421	60	5,074	Not available
Oaks, OK	175,109	32	5,472	Not available
Hidalgo, TX	188,557	131	1,439	Not available
San Antonio, TX	224,771	363[1]	619	Not available
Third-Year Projects				
Kotzebue, AK	$123,117	27	$4,560	98%
Fillmore, CA	93,497	63	1,484	67%
Fremont, CA	106,720	110	970	34%
St. Paul, MN	67,011	25	2,680	Not available
Manhattan, NY	254,426	30	8,481	Not available
Queen, NY	195,000	60	3,250	Not available
Oklahoma City, OK	57,919	82	706	30%
Seattle, WA	70,050	29	2,416	Not available

---

[1] This is an approximate number of children enrolled in the preschool programs in the four school districts served by the San Antonio, TX, project.

Miami, FL	5,241
Oaks, OK	5,472
Manhattan, NY	8,481

Generally, where budgets per child were below $2,000, the Special Populations Preschool grant paid for the costs of services that supplemented the preschool project. For example, the San Antonio, TX, project was a staff training endeavor; the costs of operating the classrooms were borne by other sources. The Hidalgo, TX, project was a curriculum development effort; the local school systems paid for the preschool program. The Kansas City, MO, and Oklahoma City, OK, projects were private preschools that charged fees; the Special Populations Preschool grant helped an existing program expand a bilingual component.

Among those projects with Special Populations Preschool budgets of $200,000 or more, most seemed to be supporting a full preschool program. Those under the auspices of school districts were provided with support from the districts, usually in the form of in-kind space and utilities, sometimes with transportation, nutrition services (participation in the School Lunch program), and access to specialists such as the school nurse, handicapped specialists, counselors, and others. The Miami, FL, project was an exception. The district supported the preschool program and provided a wide range of services. The Special Populations grant supplemented an existing program by adding a bilingual component.

One project, Manhattan, NY, was considerably more expensive than the others. The budget per preschool child of $8,481 was $3,000 per child more than the next more expensive project. In fact, the school district provided the space for the program and supplementary services, as was true of several other projects. It may be that, in the future, a calculation of budget per child could assist OBEMLA in making decisions about the appropriate size of grants. A ceiling of $5,500 or $6,000 seems reasonable, given the sizes of grants that support full programs.

During the course of our telephone interviews and site visits, we asked project directors to estimate the costs committed by school systems and other funding sources for these projects. For the most part, project directors were unable to make such an estimate. The cost of the School Lunch program is not determined separately for the preschool children; neither is transportation, where preschool children ride the same bus as elementary school children, or have access to the services of a school nurse who is available for any child in need. The costs of adding preschoolers are marginal to the existing central operation of these services, but an exact cost is not calculated by any district. In consequence, we could not quantify the value of the services provided by the agency or school system that housed each program.

In addition, most grantees did not quantify the in-kind services they received. That is, they could not provide estimates of the value of volunteer time in the classroom, materials, and food donated to the program, or the services of consultants (e.g., for staff or parent training sessions). No one required them to track these services (e.g., number of hours of service for each person, amount and value of donations), and project staff did not do so on their own.

Future Project Capacity

More than half of the projects funded for their second or third year in 1989-90 have plans and funding to continue operating after the termination of the Special Populations Preschool grant. (See Exhibit II-20, Capacity Building.) Five of the eight projects whose grants ended on October 1, 1990, found additional funding: Kotzebue, AK, and Seattle, WA, will reopen later this year with Head Start funding; Fremont, CA, has a three-year Transitional Bilingual Education grant and is using proceeds from sales of its curriculum to continue the project; St. Paul, MN, is applying for additional Title VII monies and for Head Start funding and is currently functioning with Title VII funding; and Oklahoma City, OK, has raised funds through grants and donations to continue a scaled-back version of its project.

EXHIBIT II-20

Capacity Building

Project	Action Taken/Anticipated
Second-Year Projects	
Madera, CA	Seeking funding through school district, state, private sources, and applied for additional Title VII funds
Miami, FL	Seeking district grants
Kansas City, MO	Grant from Kaufman Foundation
Brooklyn, NY	Seeking funding through local sources
Oaks, OK	Seeking funding
Hidalgo, TX	Curriculum will be used in district's prekindergarten; applied for additional Title VII funds
San Antonio, TX	Teachers will utilize training that they received from project in classrooms and share that knowledge with new teachers
Third-Year Projects	
Kotzebue, AK	Reopen as Head Start Program
Fillmore, CA	Program has ended
Fremont, CA	Three-year Transitional Bilingual Education Grant
St. Paul, MN	Applied for additional Title VII and Head Start funds; currently operating under Title V funding.
Manhattan, NY	Program has ended
Queens, NY	Program has ended
Oklahoma City, OK	Scaled back enrollment to 40; raised funds through grants/donations
Seattle, WA	Scaled back enrollment to 18; State-funded Head Start project with sheltered English approach

Six of the seven second-year projects are actively seeking funding or have promises of funding to allow for their continuation. Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, are seeking funding; Kansas City, MO, will receive a grant from the Kaufman Foundation; Hidalgo, TX, will use the curriculum its staff have devised under the grant in the regular state-funded preschool program and is seeking additional Title VII funding.

Conclusions: Keys to Success; Major Challenges; Recommendations

Staff in each project were asked to name the aspects of the project that they felt were key to its success, the major challenges that they faced, and any recommendations they had for bilingual preschool projects that were currently in the process of design and development. Each is applying for additional Title VII monies and for Head Start funding and is currently functioning with Title VII funding; and Oklahoma City, OK, has raised funds through grants and donations to continue a scaled-back version of its project.

Six of the seven second-year projects are actively seeking funding or have promises of funding to allow for their continuation. Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK, are seeking funding; Kansas City, MO, will receive a grant from the Kaufman Foundation; Hidalgo, TX, will use the curriculum its staff have devised under the grant in the regular state-funded preschool program and is seeking additional Title VII funding.

Keys to Success; Major Challenges; Recommendations

Staff in each project were asked to name the aspects of the project that they felt were key to its success, the major challenges that they faced, and any recommendations they had for bilingual preschool projects that were currently in the process of design and development. Each suggestion was classified according to its content as relating to one of 11 categories, generally following the categories of the site summaries:

- Project goals;

- Recruitment;
- Curriculum;
- Other aspects of project organization and design;
- Parent involvement;
- Non-instructional services;
- Staff qualifications and training;
- School linkages;
- Community linkages;
- Funding; and
- Record keeping.

Keys to Success

Every project offered at least one key to its success; in all, 43 separate suggestions were given. All 15 projects cited some aspect of staff qualifications and training as key to their success. The picture created by these suggestions is of hard working and caring staff, who speak the language of the children, value different cultures, and work well together. They should be experienced in working with children, have training in early childhood education and bilingual education, and receive ongoing training in these areas throughout the project. They should be committed to the project, ensuring a stability for children and little staff turnover.

Success was due to key elements in each of the areas of parent involvement, curriculum, and school linkages for about half of the projects. That is, seven projects cited elements in parent involvement and curriculum; six projects cited elements in school linkages. The major issue in the area of parent involvement was getting a large percentage of parents to join project activities and to spread by word of mouth the advantages of the program. An "ideal" curriculum is well developed, well rounded, and developmentally appropriate. It is multicultural in its approach and integrates the child's native language well. Successful school linkages require involving school personnel in the planning and implementation of the project and continuing good communication with the principal and kindergarten teachers of the receiving school(s).

Multiple suggestions of keys to success were given in the areas of community linkages (three ideas) and other aspects of project organization and design (two ideas). In general, project staff felt that strong community support facilitated publicity, fund-raising, advocacy for families, and providing additional support services for families. One individual felt that group sizes of under 15 children were central to a project's success; another felt that their practice of encouraging visits to model classes was critical.

Finally, one suggestion was made regarding each of the areas of goals, non-instructional services, and funding. The following were deemed crucial: a clear statement of goals; the provision of transportation for preschoolers that was separate from that for elementary school students; and sufficient funding to cover all aspects of the project.

Major Challenges

Eleven projects offered one or more "challenges." Seven projects cited parent involvement as a key challenge. In each case, parents were slow to become involved in the project, perhaps because of a belief that education should be done by the schools and not the parent or perhaps because they were working and had little time.

The other areas in which multiple projects cited challenges were recruitment, aspects of project organization, staff, and funding. The recruitment issues involved both locating families of LEP children and convincing them to enroll their children. A variety of challenges were cited by projects, including integrating the project teacher into an existing classroom (Miami, FL); finding space for meetings, workshops, and outdoor play (Brooklyn, NY); to trying to do too much by developing a curriculum, training staff, and operating a program for children (Kotzebue, AK);

feeling that children were overtested because of Special Populations Preschool requirements (Queens, NY); and the particularly difficult issue of maintaining a developmentally appropriate curriculum when the state set stringent educational requirements for first graders, and elementary school teachers wanted incoming children to have a specific set of skills (San Antonio, TX). Though only one site mentioned this latter challenge, it holds true for other school systems as well.

The four projects discussing staffing issues targeted finding good staff and preventing turnover as challenges. Kotzebue, AK, could not find qualified staff who spoke the Inupiaq language. With low pay and few benefits, staff in Madera, CA, and Oklahoma City, OK, did not have a great incentive to stay. Kansas City, MO, has suffered considerable turnover in each year of the project and cited low pay as the reason. As might be expected, Kansas City, MO, also cited finding enough cash to continue all aspects of the project as a challenge. Kotzebue, AK, and Fillmore, CA, cited the other funding challenges in reporting that the town/district did not relay cash to them in a timely fashion. Finally, one project (Madera, CA), referred to complicated reporting and accounting procedures required by this Title VII grant as creating a challenge for its staff.

Recommendations for Future Projects

From the most often to the least often made, suggestions for future projects follow:

- Staffing. Hire professional, bilingual, caring staff who will be committed to the success of the project, work well together, and value cultural differences; provide them with an ongoing training program in child development and the curriculum of choice.

- Parent involvement. Engender strong parent commitment and involvement from the onset of the project. Schedule parent activities at the convenience of parents.

- Project organization. Create an appropriate testing program; do not overtest; develop a daily schedule that responds to parent needs; make sure space is safe for children; include non-LEP children, if possible; and make sure every component of the project serves the needs of the population.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Goals. Define goals well; do not try to do too much; take the time to plan thoroughly and develop the curriculum; and make sure to elicit input from everyone who will be involved in the project.

- Curriculum. Be sure to choose a good curriculum: one that you believe in, is developmentally appropriate and child-centered; and reaches the "whole child."

- Non-instructional services. Provide transportation and plan for meeting the social service needs of families.

- School linkages. Establish good communication with the receiving school to ease children's transition to kindergarten.

- Record-keeping. Keep good records from the beginning; use a computer to store data.

- Community linkages. Gain and maintain community support for the project.

- Funding. Obtain sufficient funding for the entire project in advance.

CHAPTER III

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS

The primary purpose of our evaluation effort is to describe the projects currently funded by Special Populations Preschool grants. In some sense that purpose has been accomplished by the reporting of results in Chapter II. However, there are several findings cited in Chapter II that have serious implications for the continuing review and management of the Special Populations Preschool Program. To demonstrate these implications in the following sections, we first discuss the significance of results concerning project operation and then turn to results regarding outcomes for children (in terms of participant progress) and the program (in terms of future capacity building). Following the presentations of results, we make recommendations for changes in the grant award process and the monitoring of awards. Finally, we use the findings to gauge the expected success of projects that have just finished their first year of operation within the Special Populations Preschool Program.

Implications of Results Concerning Project Operation

Four aspects of the results concerning project operation have implications for the selection of future grantees: data on the number of LEP children, low-income families, and kindergarten children served by the projects; findings on the developmental appropriateness of programs; staff suggestions of keys to their success and challenges; and information on costs.

Data on the Population Served

Projects differed on three enrollment issues of potential interest to program managers: the percentage of LEP children served; the percentage of low-income families served; and the percentage of kindergarten children served. Regulations for the Special Populations Preschool grants do not prohibit serving English-speaking children, middle-income families, and kindergarten students (providing school funding is appropriately used to pay for core services). But program managers may wish to establish priorities in each of these areas or limitations on the percentages of children in each of these groups who may be served.

For example, eight of the 15 projects reviewed enrolled over 90 percent LEP children, and six programs enrolled from 51 to 90 percent LEP children. But one project, Kansas City, MO, had only 24 percent LEP children in 1989-90. In consequence, most of the children who were served by project funds in this site were native speakers of English. Is there a minimum percentage of LEP children to be served that ensures that the projects are for "limited English proficient" children?

Similar results were obtained regarding the percentage of low-income families served. In 14 of the 15 sites, the majority of families were defined as low income in terms of their eligibility for free or reduced price lunches. But in Miami, FL, 48 percent of families met this criterion. Is there an intention or spirit in the regulations that this should be a program for low-income families?

Finally, three of the projects served preschool-aged and kindergarten children (Oaks, OK; San Antonio, TX; and Fremont, CA). In each case, project funds supplemented the kindergarten programs and did not pay for such core expenses as the salaries of the teachers. But the projects considered that the kindergarten students were a part of their "number served," thus making this number larger than perhaps it should be. It seems valuable to encourage projects to assist children in their transition from preschool to kindergarten. Including kindergarten teachers in staff training sessions, exchanging records, and visiting each other's classes accomplish this sort of goal. The question is whether activities such as developing a kindergarten curriculum; paying for an aide for the kindergarten classroom; or paying for field trips, equipment, and materials for the kindergarten classroom are also appropriate.

It may be useful for Department of Education (ED) staff to

- Discuss future policies to be incorporated into the Special Populations Preschool program with regard to a minimum percentage of LEP children and a minimum percentage of low-income families to be served; and
- Devise a list of kindergarten activities that may be funded under the projects.

Developmental Appropriateness

During the development of the design of this study, ED staff expressed concern over the issue of the developmental appropriateness of programs. The goal of ED staff is to ensure that bilingual preschool projects are operating within a developmentally appropriate context for children. The findings from our site visits suggest that about half of the projects have developmentally appropriate programs (Madera, CA; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK), and half are not as developmentally appropriate as they might be (Kansas City, MO; Hidalgo, TX; and Fremont, CA). What is lacking in these latter programs is child-initiated learning, exemplified in part by a lack of availability of materials for creative activities and space to be alone. But the conclusion concerning developmental appropriateness is also supported by our observations of a predominance of teacher-directed learning activities. In Hidalgo, TX, project managers and some teachers were very aware of the issue and working to make classrooms more developmentally appropriate. In Fremont, CA, the difficulty seemed to stem from one teacher's approach and was not systemic. In Kansas City, MO, the issue seemed to be that no individual working in the project had any training in early childhood education. Those who were trained had backgrounds in elementary education; they did not seem to be aware of developmentally appropriate treatment of preschoolers.

Two explanations for the emphasis on teacher-directed learning in these latter three projects are immediately apparent. First, many project staff reported that parents considered preschool to be equivalent to babysitting and seemed to feel that children's learning did not begin until elementary school. It may be that project staff have responded to this belief by "proving" to parents that preschool children can be educated. Second, most of the projects exist within the context of a school system and are housed in an elementary school building. The business of most of the school staff is "education" or "teaching". In school systems with a testing program that stipulates the knowledge a child must have to progress from one grade to the next, the elementary school teachers are very likely to pressure the preschool to make sure children have a core set of knowledge and skills before they enter kindergarten. If project staff allow these pressures to guide their curriculum, we may expect a strong educational orientation replacing a more developmentally appropriate approach.

To ensure project staff's sensitivity to developmentally appropriate practice, it might be useful for ED to request that applicants' proposals include a discussion of the curriculum and approach to be used in the implementation of the program:

- Approaches could be judged as overly instructional as opposed to emphasizing child-directed learning.
- Staff job descriptions and qualifications could be reviewed to ensure that training in early childhood education was included for the director, teachers, and paraprofessionals. If staff are to be hired without such training, the proposal can be reviewed to ensure that in-service training on developmental issues will occur.
- The yearly evaluation could be monitored to check that appropriate staff training actually did occur.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several of the keys to success, major challenges, and recommendations for future projects that were discussed by project staff have valuable implications for decision making about Special

Populations Preschool grants. In particular, project staff discussed staffing issues, parent involvement, and issues arising in the recruitment process.

Staffing

The basic staff qualifications suggested in our interviews included several that are not found on traditional resumes: hard-working, caring, committed to the project, able to work well in a team, and openness to culture differences. But others of the qualifications could be checked in the process of reviewing new grant proposals. Specifically, staff should:

- Have previous experience in working with preschool-age children;
- Have previous training in early childhood education and bilingual education; and
- Receive ongoing training in child development and bilingual education throughout the duration of the project.

In addition, at least some members of the staff should be able to communicate in the child's native language.

Parent Involvement

Many project staff cited the importance of involving parents in the education and development of their children from the onset of the project. For some staff, the reason for parent involvement is a firm belief that parents are the primary educators of their child and will continue to serve in that function after the child finishes a preschool program. For others, the reason seems more pragmatic, that involving parents means that the family is committed to helping the program, children will attend regularly, and that changes may occur in the family (e.g., the parent learning English) that will enhance the effects of the program on the child.

But project staff cited a number of difficulties in convincing parents to become involved. Sometimes the issue was time: many parents were employed, so that they were not free during the hours the program operated and were reluctant to give up evening hours for project activities. At other times, staff cited beliefs on the part of parents that interfered with their involvement.

Some parents felt they had little to contribute and did not respond to an open invitation (e.g., Oaks, OK), but when the project director said she expected them to participate and told them what she wanted them to do, many became very active. Some parents seemed to feel that education is the responsibility of the schools, and needed to learn how they could be a part of the child's learning process.

It may be appropriate to institute a requirement for Special Populations Preschool projects to have a parent component, defined in their project objectives and design:

- Each application can be reviewed for the quality of its parent involvement component, ensuring that each project has realistic plans to involve parents by using them as volunteers in the classroom or on field trips, offering parent training sessions, and including parents in ethnic festivals or other cultural awareness activities.

Recruitment

Recruitment issues were cited as challenges by staff in a number of projects. In certain areas the problem was locating LEP children. For example, in Kansas City, MO, the project was located in a traditional Hispanic neighborhood. Most of the local residents were second- and third-generation Hispanic Americans, and many spoke English in their homes. New immigrants were more frequently moving into other neighborhoods that have begun to be served by other agencies. Locating LEP children was not a simple task.

In other projects, the issue was more one of convincing parents that a bilingual preschool program would be valuable for their child. Many of the Hispanic parents that were contacted by project staff in a number of sites felt that preschool children should be in the home cared for by family. In one community (Brooklyn, NY), Spanish-speaking parents were more inclined to enroll their children in a monolingual English-speaking program, believing that their children would learn more English and succeed more rapidly in elementary school. Staff had a difficult and time-consuming task to convince parents of the potential advantages of enrollment in the bilingual projects. In Hidalgo, TX, for example, staff felt the need to go from house to house talking with parents of eligible children. An invitation in a written document was insufficient.

In evaluating proposals for new grants, ED staff might choose to require that project design include a description of the recruitment process:

- Applicants should discuss the process they will use to recruit LEP children and families to ensure that the enrollment figures proposed will be met.

Project Budgets

The total grant amounts of the second- and third-year projects differed tremendously (from $57,919 in Oklahoma City, OK, to $304,421 in Brooklyn, NY), as did the proposed budget amounts per child of operating the programs (from $619 in San Antonio to $8,481 in Manhattan, NY). Although the budget per child was not related to outcomes for children, it did seem to be related to future project capacity. Projects that received full funding for all of their operations from the Special Populations Preschool grant seemed less likely to be able to continue after the termination of the grant than those for whom grant funds were supplementary.

In reviewing grant applications, ED staff might consider:

- Calculating cost per child for each applicant and using this as a guide for negotiating grant amounts; and
- Setting a ceiling on cost per child of $5,000 to $5,500, thus encouraging projects to find additional funding (if needed) to operate a full program.

Implications of Results Concerning Project Outcomes

The two major measures of outcomes that we have investigated concern the progress of project participants over the course of their year in a bilingual preschool program and the ability of projects to continue operation after the termination of their three-year Special Populations grant.

We found limited results concerning children's progress in English language skills. Each of these diverse projects seems to engender gains in this area, but at the end of the year, on average, children remain in the category of non-English speaker. Where testing is done, from 10 to 25 percent of children progress to the point of being admitted to mainstreamed kindergarten classrooms. It would seem that ED's strategy of funding a diverse set of approaches to bilingual preschool education has worked: children are making progress. It does not appear that any one kind of project stands out as encouraging more progress than another, so it would seem that continuing to fund a diverse group of grantees is warranted.

Projects have differed, however, in their ability to continue operation after the termination of the Special Populations grant. Among the eight projects whose grants ended on September 30, 1990, five have continued operation. Kotzebue, AK, and Seattle, WA, have continued as Head Start programs, and St. Paul, MN, has applied for Head Start funds while it is continuing with Title V funding. Fremont, CA, received a three-year Transitional Bilingual Education Grant. Oklahoma City, OK, has raised funds through grants and donations. The other three programs have ended (Fillmore, CA; Manhattan, NY; and Queens, NY).

This differentiation of projects by ability to continue after the termination of the Special Populations Preschool grant has three important implications. First, it is interesting to note that the projects that have ended are all school system grantees who received a large proportion (or all) of their program funding from the Special Populations Preschool grant. The local school district could not replace the funding. Second, the one single-purpose child care agency on the list (Oklahoma City, OK), that operated prior to receiving a Special Populations grant continues to operate without this grant. It has found additional funding to continue its bilingual curriculum. Third, three of the projects that were able to continue have applied for or are using Head Start funds. With the 1991 expansion of Head Start funding by $400 million, it would appear that this national program is also a potential contributor for continuation programs for grantees whose Special Populations funding will end in September 1991.

The same sorts of implications arise from reviewing the anticipated continuation of projects still in operation. Several of the school system grantees (Madera, CA; Miami, FL; Brooklyn, NY; and Oaks, OK), are seeking funding but have no current commitment. The projects that supplemented existing programs (Hidalgo and San Antonio, TX), will continue in that the bilingual preschool classes will go on using the new curriculum refined under the Special Populations grant and the teachers who were trained under the grant will continue their work. Again, the one independent agency (Kansas City, MO), will continue its program, having, in this case, found additional funding through a foundation grant.

If continuation of a bilingual preschool program after the termination of the Special Populations Preschool grant is important to ED, then the selection process can be used to isolate those projects most likely to continue. They are either:

- Agencies (either independent or school systems) operating preschools who are supplementing current funding with Special Population grants to add a bilingual component; or
- Agencies requesting funding to develop a curriculum, train teachers, or provide technical assistance to existing programs.

The projects least likely to be able to continue are school systems requesting complete funding for a new bilingual preschool program. ED may or may not wish to use this information in structuring its criteria for awards, depending on the importance of future capacity building.

In addition, it appears that Head Start is a potential funding source for terminating Special Populations grantees. The fact that nearly 20 percent of Head Start children have home languages other than English means that many of its programs have experience with LEP children; some offer fully bilingual programs. It may be that liaison between the programs at a national level could benefit both parties.

The Prognosis for First-Year Projects

Many of the issues discussed above cannot be evaluated for the first-year projects because sufficient information is not available in the applications. First, most applications include job descriptions, but not the resumes of staff who will work on the project, so it is not possible to assess the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals. A review of second-year applications might allow for such an assessment, but that is for a later evaluation project. Second, most applications state that staff training will be done, but not the specific topics that it will cover. We cannot judge the degree to which projects will review early childhood and bilingual education issues. Third, projects are not required to include a parent involvement component, so few discuss this issue in their applications. A review of the first-year evaluations might show the degree of such involvement, but these documents had not arrived in time for our file review. Fourth, there is little information on recruitment. We do not know if projects were able to reach full enrollment or whether they experienced problems. The first-year evaluation information is needed for this item as well. Finally, we are unable to judge the developmental appropriateness of the curriculum without the opportunity of a site visit or, at the least, a review or an in-depth discussion of the curriculum and instructional approach (which are not currently found in applications).

The only useful data that are available (see Appendix A) concern the budgets of projects. The range in amounts for 1989-90 was $70,063 in Stilwell, OK, (Bell Elementary), to $252,255 in Albuquerque, NM. The budgets on a per-child basis are:

El Rito, NM	$ 384
Barrow, AK	392
Pago Pago, AS	392
Stilwell, OK (I-25)	443
Anthony, NM	480
Agana, GU	581
Stilwell, OK (Bell)	1,208

Del Rio, TX	1,212
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)	2,157
Pasadena, CA	2,416
Unalakleet, AK	2,654
Albuquerque, NM	2,803
Soledad, CA	3,000
Tacoma, WA	3,296

All of these are under the proposed ceiling of $5,500. Since all of them are school system grantees, continuation of the program after the termination of the Special Populations Preschool grant may be suspect, at least in the last six projects (those with budgets per child of over $2,000). But it is very difficult to make such a judgment with the limited data we have at hand.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Key Data

(Special Populations Preschool Projects Not Analyzed in Report)

First-Year Projects

Barrow, AK
Unalakleet, AK
Pasadena, CA
Soledad, CA
Albuquerque, NM
Anthony, NM
El Rito, NM
Stilwell, OK (Bell Elementary)
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)
Stilwell, OK (District I-25)
Del Rio, TX
Tacoma, WA

Second-Year Projects

Pago Pago, AS
Agana, GU

EXHIBIT 1

Participant Characteristics

Project	Project Year	Number Enrolled		% LEP	Ages	Native Languages	Race/Ethnicity	Population Density	% Low Income
		Estimated	Actual						
First-Year Projects									
Barrow, AK	89-90	288		52%	3-4	Inupiaq, English	Alaska Native	Rural	17%
Unalakleet, AK	89-90	66		91%	3-4	Siberian Yupik, Inupiaq, English,	Alaska Native	Rural	87%
Pasadena, CA	89-90	58		86%		Spanish, English	Hispanic	Suburban	100%
Soledad, CA	89-90	50		100%	4	Spanish	Hispanic	Suburban	64%
Albuquerque, NM	89-90	90		100%	4-5	Spanish	Hispanic, Native American, Asian	Urban	94%
Anthony, NM	89-90	300		100%	4-5	Spanish	Hispanic	Suburban	100%
El Rito, NM	89-90	365		91%	3-5	Spanish, English	Hispanic	Rural	95%
Stilwell, OK (Bell Elementay)	89-90	58		93%	3-5	Cherokee, English	Native American	Rural	60%
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)	89-90	106		78%	3-5	Cherokee, English	Native American	Rural	78%
Stilwell (School District I-25)	89-90	365		84%	3-4	Cherokee, English	Native American	Rural	89%

EXHIBIT 1

Participant Characteristics (Continued)

Project	Project Year	Number Enrolled		% LEP	Ages	Native Languages	Race/Ethnicity	Population Density	% Low Income
		Estimated	Actual						
Del Rio, TX	89-90	100		100%	3-4	Spanish	Hispanic	Rural	100%
Tacoma, WA	89-90	60		100%	4-5	Khmer, Spanish, Vietnamese, Lao	Asian, Hispanic	Urban	89%
Second-Year Projects									
Pago Pago, AS	89-90	344		87%	5	Samoan, Korean, Palagi, English	Samoan, Korean, Palagi	Rural	100%
Agana, GU	89-90	320		100%	4-5	Chamorro	Chamorro, Filipino	Rural	

EXHIBIT 2

Project Operations

Project	Affiliation	Schedule				Amount of Grant/ Budget Per Preschool Child Expenditure	Parental Involvement
		Hours/Day	Days/Week	Weeks/Year	Number of Years		
First-Year Projects							
Barrow, AK	Public			32 weeks		$112,886.00/ 392.00	Parent training Volunteers
Unalakleet, AK	Public				2 years	$175,189.00/ 2,654.00	Parent meetings
Pasadena, CA	Public					$140,122.00/ 2,416.00	Parent training Parent Advisory Council
Soledad, CA	Public	3 2/3 hours		36 weeks	1 year	$150,000.00/ 3,000.00	Parent training Parent Advisory Council Evaluation forms
Albuquerque, NM	Public	1/2 day	4 days	School year		$252,255.00/ 2,803.00	Volunteers
Anthony, NM	Public	4 1/2 hours	5 days	7 weeks in summer		$143,881.00/ 480.00	Volunteers Parent Advisory Council
El Rito, NM	Public					$140,289.00/ 384.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council

EXHIBIT 2

Project Operations (Continued)

Project	Affiliation	Schedule				Amount of Grant/ Budget Per Preschool Child Expenditure	Parental Involvement
		Hours/Day	Days/Week	Weeks/Year	Number of Years		
Stilwell, OK (Bell Elementary)	Public	1/2 day	5 days	40 weeks	1-3 years	$70,063.00/ 1,208.00	Volunteers Open house Parent-teacher organization
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)	Public					$228,622.00/ 2,157.00	Parent training
Stilwell, OK (School District I-25)	Public			38 weeks	1-3 years	$161,589.00/ 443.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council English class
Del Rio, TX	Home-based	20 hours		4 weeks		$121,221.00/ 1,212.00	Training parents to be child's teacher
Tacoma, WA 10)	Public	1/2 day	5 days			$197,752.00/ 3,296.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council
Second-Year Projects							
Pago Pago, AS	Public	Pull-out				$185,819.00/ 392.00	Parent training Volunteers
Agana, GU	Public and Private			32 weeks		$135,762.00/ 581.00	Parent training Volunteers Parent Advisory Council

EXHIBIT 3

Staff Characteristics

Project	Position					Characteristics			
						Teachers		Aides	
	Project Director and Other Program Administrators	Teacher	Aide	Specialist	Other	% Bilingual	% Minority	% Bilingual	% Minority
First-Year Projects									
Barrow, AK	Project Manager (PT)	12: 1 (PT)	10: 3 (PT)	Teacher Trainer (PT) Investigator (PT)	Secretary (PT)				
Unalakleet, AK	Project Director (PT)	3 (PT)	8	3 Trainers (PT)	0	Preference to Inupiat		100%	100%
Pasadena, CA	Project Director 2 Coordinators District Bilingual Director	Teacher Resource Teacher	2	2 Community Liaisons	Health Clerk	100%		100%	
Soledad, CA	Project Director (PT)	4	4	District Program Specialist	Clerk	100%			
Albuquerque, NM	Project Coordinator Cross Cultural Supervisor	3 Resource Teacher	3	3 Home Liaisons	Secretary	100%	100%		
Anthony, NM	Project Director (PT) 4 Building Administrators	6 Resource Teachers	30	2 Community Liaisons	4 Nurses 4 Clerks	100%		100%	
El Rito, NM	Project Coordinator	18	18	6 Resource Teachers (PT) 6 Community Liaisons (PT)	Secretary	100%		100%	

EXHIBIT 3

Staff Characteristics (Continued)

	Position					Characteristics			
						Teachers		Aides	
Project	Project Director and Other Program Administrators	Teacher	Aide	Specialist	Other	% Bilingual	% Minority	% Bilingual	% Minority
Stilwell, OK (Bell Elementary)	Project Director (PT)	1	2	Early Childhood Specialist (PT)				100%	100%
Stilwell, OK (Maryetta)	Project Coordinator	Psycho-Motor skills Instructor (PT)	4	4 Early Childhood Specialists Curriculum Specialist Parent Trainer				100%	
Stilwell, OK (School District I-25)	Project Coordinator (PT)		4	2 Early Childhood Specialists Parent Trainer (PT)	Office Manager			100%	100%
Del Rio, TX	Project Supervisor	10	0	0	Secretary				
Tacoma, WA	Project Director (PT)	2	2	2 Home Liaison/ Parent Trainers	Secretary (PT)	100%		100%	
Second-Year Projects									
Pago Pago, AS	Project Director	11	0	0	Secretary	100%	100%		
Agana, GU	Project Director Project Coordinator	5 Intern		Trainer (PT) 2 Curriculum Writers	Secretary	100%		100%	

APPENDIX B

Site Summaries

Second-Year Sites

Madera, CA
Miami, FL
Kansas City, MO
Brooklyn, NY
Oaks, OK
Hidalgo, TX
San Antonio, TX

Third-Year Sites

Kotzebue, AK
Fillmore, CA
Fremont, CA
St. Paul, MN
Manhattan, NY
Queens, NY
Oklahoma City, OK
Seattle, WA

Madera Unified School District Special Populations Program
Madera, California

The Madera Unified School District operates a Title VII preschool project at three of the district's 13 elementary school sites. The school district is located in the San Joaquin Valley in central California, a rural farming community with a large annual influx of Hispanic migrant farm workers. In recent years, particularly because of amnesty for illegal aliens, this area has experienced growth in its permanent farm worker community, as more Mexican families have chosen to settle in Madera. Transient families spend the warm months living in the Madera area, returning to Mexico for the winter months. Some of the schools in Madera operate on a year-round schedule.

Nearly half of the students in the school district are Hispanic and about 20 percent are limited English proficient (LEP). About 50 percent of kindergarten students are LEP. Most LEP preschool children beginning the school year can understand little or no English and cannot speak any English. The project serves children between the ages of three years nine months and five years four months. Each child is in the program for one school year.

The Title VII bilingual preschool project was initiated because preschool-age children in elementary schools in the rural outskirts of Madera did not have access to preschool. Kindergarten teachers and school administrators at three K-8 schools--Eastin-Arcola, La Vina, and Ripperdan--noticed that many of their students scored low in language development, as measured by the Bilingual Syntax Measurement (BSM) and in school readiness skills, as measured by scores on the Test of Basic Experiences (TOBE). Teachers found that these incoming LEP children lacked social skills or understanding of basic concepts such as identifying colors, using scissors, and using table utensils. Notices of a public hearing were sent to parents with children in public school to solicit their comments on the need for preschools. Parents at the meeting and through letters indicated interest in setting up preschools for their children.

Program Philosophy

The development and design of the preschool project was based on reviews of Head Start programs and state preschool programs in neighboring counties. The school district applied research on second language acquisition and primary language development from Krashen and Cummins. One of the primary principles gleaned from their research was the use of one English-speaking adult and one Spanish-speaking adult to model the use of each language in the classroom. This method was used because it was found that modeling was better received and languages less confused if two persons equally represented the two languages. The school district's examination of the research on other programs also found that the more effective schools had low teacher/student ratios and teachers who taught only one class per day.

Kindergarten teachers were given questionnaires to determine the kinds of skills they expected incoming kindergarten students to have. Their comments were incorporated into the program development plan. Teachers pointed to lack of oral language development, lack of school readiness, and confusion of English and Spanish. They noted that many children had no recognition of colors, shapes, numbers, or letters; lacked survival skills; and had little or no exposure to books, playgrounds, or toys.

Project Goals

The primary goals of the preschool project are to provide readiness skills for kindergarten in each child's native language and expose children to English. The overall purpose of the project is to encourage developmentally appropriate proficiency rather than academic skills, in part because kindergarten is not mandatory in California. More specific goals include development of fine/gross motor skills and social-emotional skills (e.g., survival, sharing, having feelings for others, learning rules and consequences), learning basic colors, recognizing numbers and letters, and increasing scores on the BSM by at least one level.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

The project utilizes a variety of methods to recruit children. These methods include:

- Sending notes and flyers (in English and Spanish) home with children in elementary grades;
- Holding community meetings for parents of small children;
- Word of mouth through former children and their families; and
- Advertisements on the radio and in the local newspaper, Madera Tribune.

In order to be accepted into the preschool program, children have to live in the attendance area of the elementary school in which the preschool is housed. Potential participants are screened through the BSM. Preference is given to children living in Spanish-speaking homes and dominant in Spanish with little or no exposure to English. Fifteen of the 20 class slots are reserved for LEP children.

Some migrant resource staff help to refer families with preschool-aged children. The most successful source of recruitment is the school system, by which teachers and administrators ask students if they have preschool-aged siblings or look through migrant family documents. For some parents, this is seen as an opportunity for free child care for their small children.

School district staff indicated that overcrowding in schools has motivated parents to enroll their children early, so recruitment has not been a problem. Once the 20-child limit for each class is exceeded, the schools set up waiting lists, one for LEP children and one for English proficient children. Priority is given to LEP children because of their greater need.

Enrollment

Each of the three schools served approximately 20 children per class per year. Enrollment for the three schools for the three years of the project is as follows:

	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Eastin-Arcola (two classes)	38	38	35
La Vina	19	19	19
Ripperdan	19	19	18

During the first two years of the project, about 75 to 90 percent of children tested as LEP, but only about half of the children are LEP in the FY 1991 program year. Almost all children come from families below the federal poverty level and receive free or reduced-price lunches. Most of the children are Mexican, with the largest minority being Anglo. A handful of children are Asian, Black, or Middle Eastern.

Retention

About 25 percent of project participants do not complete the school year, due largely to families migrating to different regions to obtain seasonal work. The district attempts to keep children in the program by offering various support services, including access to the school bus service, occasional home visits by teachers, lunch programs, and access to each school's nurse. District staff also point to the low teacher/child ratio, input from principals and kindergarten teachers, and the mere fact of having a preschool available as incentives to remain.

A study of attendance during the FY 1989 school year indicated that class attendance varied widely from month to month (e.g., 43 percent in September vs. 97 percent in January), but was fairly low, averaging about 58 percent across the year.

Schedules

Classes meet four days each week, for about three and a half hours per day. Four classes are held each day: one morning class at each of the three schools and an afternoon class at Eastin-Arcola. The fifth day is reserved for staff development, home visits, recordkeeping, and planning.

A sample daily schedule for one school (Eastin-Arcola) is as follows:

11:00a.m. - 11:30a.m.	Circle Time (English)
11:30a.m. - 11:40a.m.	Wash hands
11:40a.m. - 11:45a.m.	Leave for lunch
11:45a.m. - 12:20p.m.	Lunch
12:20p.m. - 12:30p.m.	Wash hands/bathroom
12:30p.m. - 12:45p.m.	Circle Time (Spanish)
12:45p.m. - 1:10p.m.	Activity I -- structured learning
1:10p.m. - 1:30p.m.	Activity II -- e.g., small groups
1:30p.m. - 2:00p.m.	Outdoor play
2:00p.m. - 2:10p.m.	Bathroom
2:10p.m. - 2:20p.m.	Snack
2:20p.m. - 2:30p.m.	Music
2:30p.m. - 2:50p.m.	Free play
2:50p.m. - 3:05p.m.	Clean-up
3:05p.m.	Leave for bus

Instructional Strategies

Two school sites were observed: Ripperdan and Eastin-Arcola. The class at Ripperdan meets in a portable classroom on school grounds, while the Eastin-Arcola class meets in a kindergarten classroom in the school building.

The two circle times are whole-group instructional times; Activities I and II are often small-group activities; free play allows time for children to play by themselves or in small groups. Throughout all activities, the teachers controlled children carefully; there was little freedom for children to move about, choose their own activities, or be creative. For example, following the second circle time on the day of our observation, teachers directed children to specific areas to play or work on a designated activity. One area had Lincoln logs, another a color lotto game, a third had a Fisher-Price farmhouse and school, and two tables had art activities. The teachers worked with children at the art tables, coloring dittos of winter clothing items or decorating a paper mitten. Teachers instructed children to move from table to table to ensure that each child had an opportunity to finish both art activities. Children interacted with the teachers about these activities, but had little interaction among themselves. For instance, the four boys playing with Lincoln logs spent 15 minutes at this activity without speaking to each other.

Curriculum. Teachers used monthly themes including colors, seasons, animals, senses, food, holidays, shapes, emotions, and weather. Daily activities for circle time and structured learning sessions followed the monthly theme.

Language Usage

The bilingual team teaching model is carried through by having one teacher speak only in English and one only in Spanish. All activities directed by the English-model teacher use English; activities directed by the Spanish-model teacher use Spanish. Rather than having one individual repeat and translate what the other has said on a phrase-by-phrase basis, teachers often reinforce activities in two languages by constructing parallel activities to reinforce the same vocabulary.

Classroom Observations. During our visit, we observed morning activities. During the first circle time at Ripperdan, the English-model teacher said "Good morning" to each child and had the child greet her in English, discussed the calendar (having children repeat numbers up to four in English and repeat the name of each day of the week), led a discussion of the weather (the monthly theme) and the appropriate clothing to wear, reinforced the discussion of clothing through the use of a flannel board, and led children in singing a song. All activities were conducted in English. During the second circle time, the Spanish-model teacher reviewed the calendar and had children count to four in Spanish, named the days of the week, and used the flannel board to discuss clothing. Children were encouraged to repeat vocabulary in Spanish.

Materials and Equipment

Rooms are large enough to accommodate 20 children and are well lighted with accessible bathrooms. At the time of our observation, classroom equipment and materials were in good condition, with furnishings of appropriate size for preschoolers. Sufficient materials were available in class for cognitive, language, and reasoning activities; fine and gross motor development; and creative activities. Multiracial and nonsexist books and displays were evident. Commercial and teacher-made materials about current activities were displayed along with work by children. Children's art, in the form of Christmas trees and bears, predominated.

Non-Instructional Services

Preschool participants have access to many of the services available to other elementary school students. These services include bus service, health screening through a school nurse, and a school lunch program for low-income children. Almost all children qualify for free or reduced-price lunches.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Children's progress is measured by teacher observation through a checklist (individual assessment file) and scoring on standardized tests including the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM), Test of Basic Education (TOBE), and ABC Inventory. At least six months must elapse between pre-tests and post-tests (given within the last month of the program year). The individual assessment file (IAF) is a recordkeeping system in which the teacher observes and checks off the child's demonstration of 30 abilities in each of four developmental areas: social, physical, intellectual, and language. A compilation of IAF data showed that children demonstrated the most abilities in physical and social development and the least in language development.

Results on BSM tests in 1989-90 indicated that the average score on the English test at the end of the year was 2.53 and the average on the Spanish test was 2.19. A "2" on the BSM is "receptive English/Spanish only," meaning that children can understand a limited amount of verbal English or Spanish but cannot speak the language other than through brief statements or verbal routines. A child is considered a "former" LEP when he or she scores a four or above on the English version of the BSM.

The TOBE was used during the first year of the project to measure readiness for kindergarten and was later replaced by the ABC Inventory, an oral response and task performance test. Scoring on the ABC Inventory in 1989-90 (based on a small sample of children), as well as anecdotal comments from teachers and administrators, indicated that children made substantial gains in school readiness skills.

The project has plans to establish comparison groups by using entering kindergarten children, possibly at the end of the third year. Test scores on the BSM and ABC Inventory will be compared for three groups: (1) children with a minimum of six months in bilingual preschool, (2) those with other preschool experience, and (3) those with no preschool experience.

The level of progress anticipated for each child depends on the amount of time spent in the bilingual preschool program. While district administrators indicated that progress in language development has not been as high as they had hoped, kindergarten teachers and principals observed that they could readily distinguish which incoming children had been in preschool. For example, they observed that preschool children did not cry as much as non-preschool children; they could use a fork and spoon, hold a pencil correctly, walk in a line, understand directions, and sit and listen; they could recognize the letters of the alphabet, knew shapes and colors, and could begin to count. Kindergarten teachers found this to be of major help because they did not have to spend as much time teaching social skills and could begin lessons earlier and with fewer interruptions.

Follow-Up Evaluations

Children from the Title VII program are placed in bilingual or English-only kindergarten classes, depending on the school's program rather than individual progress. Ripperdan, a bilingual school, places children in the bilingual kindergarten class. Children are then grouped in a Spanish or English reading group. Most of the Title VII children entering Ripperdan's kindergarten class in 1990-91 were placed in the Spanish group. La Vina also places all preschool children in a bilingual kindergarten class. Eastin-Arcola placed 14 Title VII children in the afternoon bilingual kindergarten class and two in the morning mainstreamed class because the afternoon class exceeded its 32-student limit.

Staff

Project staff consists of eight part-time teachers and no aides, based on the concept of having an English model and Spanish model for each classroom. Teachers are hired on a three and a half hour daily contract with staggered overlapping schedules. Teachers are supervised directly by each school's principal, as well as the district bilingual coordinator.

Qualifications

All eight teachers are credentialed according to state requirements and have a two-year certificate in early childhood education with training and experience in the bilingual field. Teachers are required to have a minimum of an A.A. degree, 24 units in child development, two years teaching experience, and an ability to model English or Spanish. The four Hispanic Spanish-speaking teachers and one Black English-speaking teacher are bilingual and the remaining three English-speaking teachers have minimal working knowledge of Spanish.

The school district had difficulty hiring qualified teachers this past year because two preschools opened in town and attracted potential good teachers. Because of this, one school had to hire a part-time aide for the first semester.

Two teachers were replaced in the first year of the project; one left in FY 1990 and another left in FY 1991. Attrition was due mostly to teachers going back to school or obtaining better paying jobs.

Training

Staff development is available once a week on the day teachers do not teach. Teachers receive two weeks of preservice training, usually in August, and can attend an in-service session held once a month or so for all bilingual teachers in the school district. In-service training topics have included: theory in bilingual education, management systems for the classroom, the dual language model, second language acquisition, multicultural hands-on activities, and parent training.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

Parental involvement with the preschool project is dependent on the extent of involvement encouraged at each elementary school. Through telephone calls, home visits, parent/teacher conferences, and notes sent home from school, school administrators and teachers encourage parents to work with their children at home, volunteer in the classroom, and learn about their children's development. The elementary schools also offer parent education workshops once a year, training for classroom volunteers, open houses twice a year, and parent-teacher conferences four times a year; distribute a monthly newsletter; and distribute a parent questionnaire once a year for feedback. Project staff indicate that LaVina has been the most successful of the three schools in obtaining parental involvement because the school already had a strong program in place for its K-8 students. Schools also observe holiday celebrations and ethnic heritage festivals such as Cinco de Mayo, Almond Festival, "Day of the Dead," Chinese New Year, and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, birthday.

At time of enrollment, parents are asked to sign a contract indicating that they and their children will participate in the preschool program or face a potential dismissal from the class. Some teachers felt, however, that many parents signed without really understanding the commitment involved. It has been difficult to get parents to take preschool seriously, in part because they seem to look at it more as a source of babysitting than school. Most parents do not participate, using reasons of difficult work schedules, lack of child care for younger children, or transportation difficulties. Despite the fact that the school encourages parents to ride the bus with their children, they sometimes cannot go because buses are filled or because teachers have found younger siblings disruptive in the classroom.

While few parents have served as classroom volunteers, most expressed support of bilingual preschool classes. Three parents, who were interviewed, did not seem to be knowledgeable about the overall objectives and goals of the project but were positive about what they had observed in their children's adjustment to school and oral language development. One mother said her child was no longer bored at home now that he spends mornings at school.

Another mother said she felt preschool would help her child learn English and be ready for school.

Educational and Community Linkages

The Madera Unified School District's Office of Research and Projects is responsible for the administration of the Title VII program. The office's responsibilities include fiscal accounting and management, supervision of the bilingual coordinator and specialist who planned, implemented, and evaluated the project, and training parents and staff. The school district and elementary schools provide a variety of in-kind support including: classroom space for four classes, classroom furniture, instructional materials and equipment, and utilities; on-site supervision from school principals, planning and administrative support from the district bilingual coordinator and early childhood specialists, and assistance from kindergarten teachers; and access to school services such as bus service, the school nurse, and free or reduced-price lunches. A handful of local businesses sponsor schools through student-of-the-month coupons and donations.

Follow-up for preschool children entering kindergarten is provided through lunch discussions between kindergarten and preschool teachers once or twice a week, exchange of student records, and parent/teacher conferences offered in the elementary grades. School staff have encouraged preschool children to participate in school functions and consider them as part of the student body.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

The total amount for the Special Populations Grant in FY 1990 was $98,469. Approximately 80 percent of the grant ($78,683) went to teacher salaries; about 18 percent ($18,000) paid for bus service; about 2 percent ($1,800) was used for classroom supplies, and 1 percent went to inservice training. District staff estimate that in-kind contributions totaled an additional $30,000 to $40,000 per year.

Future Project Capacity

If the Title VII funding is not renewed, the school district will attempt to continue a preschool program in the three schools funded under the current grant. Funding will be sought from state preschool, adult education cooperative preschool, and community service funds. Funding may also be obtained through Chapter I money or a possible grant from ARCO. District funding is tight because its budget was cut in half; local elementary schools do not have the capacity to fund the program.

In the face of limited funding, the school district will consider limiting the number of sites at which preschool is offered, cutting out summer programs, and reducing class time. They are also prepared to look at reducing teacher salaries, transportation costs, and the cost of supplies.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Project staff note a variety of factors that have contributed to the project's success, including:

- The ability and desire of district staff to put in a lot of work to plan and implement the project;
- Use of the English/Spanish classroom model;
- Hard work, caring, and professionalism of teachers; and
- Funding directed to child services, not to administration.

One kindergarten teacher noted that prior to the Title VII program, kindergarten teachers took for granted that incoming children would have necessary social and school readiness skills, but they have realized how much easier it is for them to teach children who have had preschool experience. If there were no preschool, one kindergarten teacher said she would need an aide to help teach skills that she feels her 32 students should have learned prior to entering kindergarten.

Major Challenges

District and school staff cited a number of obstacles they have faced in implementing the project. They had difficulty in locating LEP families and then getting parents to understand the benefits of enrolling their children in preschool. Cultural and language problems, as well as attitudinal barriers about "school" for "babies," had to be overcome. Staff also noted that low pay and no benefits for teachers was a problem. Reporting and accounting procedures for the Title VII grant were also cited as complicated and time-consuming.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Based on their experiences, staff suggested that other projects try to:

- Obtain funding for the project in advance, if possible, and make sure that it meets all project needs. It is difficult to obtain money prior to or during the school year.
- Plan everything out first, including expected outcomes.
- Select excellent staff, especially bilingual teachers who are caring, enjoy working with parents, and can work well with other teachers and administrators. Kindergarten teachers can serve on the hiring committee.
- Increase the number of hours for teachers so that they can receive benefits. Turnover is created when teachers leave for better paying teaching jobs with more hours.

- Make sure that parents get involved with their children. Children feel better and perform better in school when they know their parents are involved, even if parents do not volunteer in the classroom.

Project PLEES:
Prekindergarten for Limited English Exceptional Students
Miami, Florida

Project PLEES (Prekindergarten for Limited English Exceptional Students) is located in Dade County, Florida (Miami). The district is a highly urban environment, notorious for its high crime rate and drug use.

According to 1988-89 statistics, Dade County Public Schools have 33,301 limited English proficient students, or 12.5 percent of the total school population. Of the LEP population, 27,989 (84%) students are Hispanic, and 4,033 (12.1%) are Haitian. Recent influxes of Nicaraguans and Panamanians have pushed estimates of the LEP population to close to 40,000.

In the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) population, 565 students are served in Dade County in kindergarten and the first grade. In the prekindergarten category, approximately 380 disabled children are served by a full continuum of services. Of these children, 39 percent are limited English proficient.

The PLEES project serves 3 to 5 year old Haitian and Hispanic LEP children at two different schools: Tropical Elementary School, with a predominantly Hispanic population, and Arcola Lake Elementary School, with a predominantly Haitian population. Both schools have two of the largest prekindergarten exceptional child programs in Dade County. When the project began, both schools were serving more than 40 exceptional children from 3 to 5 years old.

Tropical Elementary School has an ethnic distribution of 74 percent Hispanic, 3 percent black non-Hispanic, and 23 percent white, Asian, American Indian. In 1987, 17.2 percent of the student population participated in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs.

Arcola Lake Elementary School has an ethnic distribution of 10 percent Hispanic, 87 percent black non-Hispanic, and 3% white, Asian, American Indian. Haitian children comprise approximately 90 percent of the total black enrollment. In 1987, there were 37 ESOL students, and the current estimate for 1990 (taking into account recent influxes) is about 100 of 1,100 students.

Program Philosophy

Project PLEES is based on research that indicates early intervention is effective in the remediation of handicapping conditions. It is designed with emphasis on the individual child and has drawn content and methodology from psychology, bilingual education, special education, bilingual special education, linguistics, sociology, child assessment, curriculum, and instructional techniques. The approach is to teach English language skills through intensive practice and drilling. In addition, children receive practice in communication skills, social/self-help skills, and cognitive skills (reading readiness and mathematics readiness).

Because of the unique needs of the LEP prekindergarten disabled children, educators believe that an awareness of cultural differences, second language acquisition, and the use of ESOL strategies are areas administrators, teachers, and support personnel need to know in order to help these children achieve their maximum potential. Therefore, all personnel working with these children receive specialized training.

The project's monthly parent meetings are designed to provide a support group for the parents and to inform the parents of issues concerning the educational needs of their children. The home visits are based on the philosophy that parents have the role as the child's first and most important teacher and that it is important to facilitate an understanding of American culture and society as it relates to the child's educational program.

Project Goals

The general objective of the PLEES project is to teach English skills, through individual child and collective input, at the prekindergarten level. This is to be accomplished through English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) techniques. The project's goals are:

- To improve the communicative competency of all participating children in the areas of understanding and speaking English.
- To improve reading readiness skills through instruction in the English language.
- To improve conceptual development and use of readiness skills through instruction in English in the area of mathematics readiness.
- To increase children's competency in social/self-help skills.
- To increase the effectiveness of the project through auxiliary and supplementary training activities.
- To provide for extensive involvement of parents of participating children.
- To identify and/or adapt instructional and assessment materials in Spanish and Haitian-Creole in order to implement the program.

A secondary objective of the project is to provide these children with the appropriate learning experiences and enriching activities that will help to develop their communication skills, social/self-help skills, and cognitive skills.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

Names of potential candidates for the ESE program are provided through either school officials, Easter Seals, or parents. At the beginning of the school year, psychologists screen the children for exceptionality.

Parents usually learn of the PLEES project when they register their children for school; however, a number of strategies are used to advertise the project. These include:

- Radio announcements of the program on Radio L'Ecole, a Haitian-Creole program on a local station in Miami;
- Announcements in Haitian-Creole by the project manager and the Coordinator of the Parent Outreach Program to parents at community and church meetings; and
- A video presentation which was recently made describing the project (available in English, Haitian-Creole, and Spanish). Excerpts have been shown on the local public television station, WLRN.

LEP children are identified at registration through the Home Language Screening Questionnaire. These questions include:

- What is/are the language(s) spoken most often in your home?
- What language did your child first learn?
- What language do your child's peers use most often to communicate?
- What language does your child use to communicate with his peers?

Children whose parents respond with a language other than English to any of the above questions are subsequently assessed for language proficiency. These assessments are conducted at the onset of the program.

The Preschool Idea Language Proficiency Test (Pre-IPT) is the assessment instrument used by the project. With a few modifications, it can assess exceptional children, and it is relatively simple to translate into other languages. Since the test is only available in English and Spanish, the PLEES staff, with the permission of the publishers, translated it into Haitian-Creole, in order to be able to assess native language proficiency. Project PLEES teachers administer the Pre-IPT and classify language proficiency based on the results.

Enrollment

In the first year of the project, 1988-89, 30 LEP children participated; in the second year, 39 LEP children participated. At present, there are 70 LEP children enrolled. The increase in enrollment is due to the addition of other schools into the project. During the second year of the project, one school was added, bringing a total of 10 other children into the program. In this, the third year of the project, four more schools have been added, bringing a total of 40 more children under the project's scope. The schools that were added, however, are not funded by project money; the project money only provides for teacher training and materials. The enrollment at the two project schools (Arcola Lake and Tropical) for 1989-90 was 29 participants, and currently in 1990-91 there are 30 participants.

Retention

All children completed the year in 1988-89. In the 1989-90 school year, 94.9 percent of the children completed the year.

Schedules

Both schools follow a similar schedule in which the school day begins at 8:30a.m. and ends at 1:45p.m., five days a week. The schedule is posted in all the classrooms. It includes time for breakfast, lunch, self-help and outside play. Time is set aside for large group activities, small group activities, clean up and rest. Both schedules have the same basic activities with a difference only in order. The following is an example of the schedule:

8:15a.m.	-	8:30a.m.	Arrival, Bathroom time
8:40a.m.	-	9:10a.m.	Breakfast and Self-Help
9:15a.m.	-	9:30a.m.	Morning Circle
9:30a.m.	-	10:30a.m.	Do and Review Activities
10:30a.m.	-	11:00a.m.	Small Group
11:00a.m.	-	11:30a.m.	Outside Play
11:30a.m.	-	12:00p.m.	Large Group
12:00p.m.	-	12:30p.m.	Lunch
12:30p.m.	-	12:45p.m.	Story Time
12:45p.m.	-	1:30p.m.	Rest Time
1:30p.m.	-	1:45p.m.	Closing Circle
1:45p.m.			Dismissal

The preschool teachers said that they usually structure the day around certain themes or key experiences (e.g., if a day's theme is bears, then the stories will be about bears, the sorting objects might be different size bears, and the children might draw pictures of bears). The project operates a pull-out program. The project bilingual instructor goes into each classroom during the school day and spends about 30 minutes in each class working directly with the LEP children, either in a small group or individually. We observed her in classrooms during morning circle time and small group activities.

Instructional Strategies

The regular classroom teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies including whole group, generally during circle time and story time; small group, generally in learning centers, and individualized instruction. The bilingual instructor, however, uses only small group or individualized instruction. She works with children as they engage in various activities. Sometimes she will work with a child during circle time, at other times, she will work with several children while they are playing in a learning center.

Language Usage

The program teaches pupils English through ESOL strategies at least 30 minutes every day. Some children, though, may receive more instruction depending on their level of proficiency. The type and duration of instruction is indicated in the teacher's lesson plan.

In both schools, there is one principal bilingual instructor for several classrooms. At Arcola, the bilingual instructor is the only instructor who speaks Haitian-Creole, though the other teachers have learned a few words. She spends at least one half hour in each of the six classes.

At Tropical, the bilingual instructor is one of three instructors who speak Spanish. When in a class with a non-Spanish-speaking teacher, she works exclusively with the LEP children, though in the other classes she usually works with a group of children. She visits four classes per day.

The bilingual instructor usually works with the LEP child(ren) on an "activity." For example, at Arcola, the bilingual instructor worked with a single LEP child in the housekeeping center, and at Tropical the bilingual instructor worked with three LEP children sorting animals by size and color. When working with the LEP children, the bilingual instructor makes sure that the children understand the activity; then she uses the activity to improve the children's vocabulary. First she gives instructions or asks questions in the children's native language and then repeats them in English. The same is done for children who answer in their native tongue--the bilingual instructor repeats the answer in English and then asks the children to repeat the English translation.

Classroom observations. During the classroom observation conducted in early December it was evident that English was used much more frequently in the classroom settings than the children's native language. In Arcola, the teachers spoke English exclusively, with only the bilingual instructor giving instruction in the native language. The bilingual instructor used Haitian-Creole approximately 80 percent of the time, especially with children who had mental disabilities. She explained that it was important to make sure that the children understand the activities and feel comfortable doing them. She tries to make the children feel at ease by validating their language. When using English, she tends to say a sentence in one language and then repeat it in the other.

In Tropical, the preschool teachers spoke mostly in English, though some of the Spanish-speaking teachers spoke Spanish to the children, as well. The bilingual instructor consistently encouraged the children to speak English in class and worked to help with their expression. This was done largely by repeating in English what the children said in Spanish. For example, when a child asked the instructor in Spanish for a book, she would then say in English, "Do you want me to give you the book?"

Facilities, Materials, and Equipment

The Arcola Lake program for Haitian preschoolers is located in a separate building recently constructed specifically for preschool disabled children. The building houses five classrooms, one small lunch room, and one conference room with a small lending library. In each classroom there is a complete bathroom (including a shower) and baby-changing facilities. The entire classroom is oriented to the height of preschoolers (low desks, chairs, shelves, and counters). Each classroom is also equipped with a special large mirrored window which allows people in the hallway to observe the classes unnoticed. Below each window is a fully operable speaker system which permits viewers to listen to the class while observing it.

Project PLEES at Tropical Elementary consists of four classrooms next to one another but not separate from the rest of the school. Each classroom has a bathroom and sink but no baby changing station. The classroom is oriented to preschoolers' height (low desks, chairs, shelves, and counters).

The Arcola Lake classrooms, which were built in the last year, are very sophisticated, modern, and replete with all of the necessary amenities. Each classroom has pupil cubby holes, teacher- and child-made displays, children's books, tapes, records, sorting games, blocks, markers, crayons, paints, and play props. There is a schedule clearly written on the wall, though no displays are written in Haitian-Creole. All of the materials are in English, except those which have been translated by the project manager or bilingual teacher. The project manager showed us a big book which she personally translated into Haitian-Creole. The most basic reason for this lack of materials is that publishing companies do not produce materials in Haitian-Creole. As a result, when reading a story, the bilingual instructor often translates as she reads. The classrooms are divided into distinct learning centers (e.g., story-telling area, painting area, etc.), and each classroom has direct access to an outdoor playground. This playground has a climber, swings, a slide, tires, and a sandbox, and because of the climate in Miami, is used throughout the year.

The Tropical classrooms are not quite as modern, but they do have the essential classroom amenities. Each classroom has pupil cubby holes, teacher- and child-made displays, children's books (in English and Spanish), tapes, records, sorting games, blocks, markers, crayons, paints, and play props. There is a schedule clearly written on the wall, and most of the displays are in English with a few things in Spanish. The classroom is similarly divided into learning centers, and each classroom has two separate exits outside. Though no playground was visible, there were riding toys on the walks outside the classrooms.

In both schools multi-racial displays, books, and dolls are part of the classroom, and both teachers and children use them freely.

Non-Instructional Services

At both schools, free bus service, testing, and meals (breakfast, lunch, and a snack) are provided by the schools to the children in the project. The schools also provide an array of services including occupational, physical, and speech therapy. In addition, the schools maintain the administrative services of the project, and the district provides secretarial support to the project manager.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Child progress in the program is measured in two ways. The first way is through the Pre-IPT which is administered at the beginning and the end of the year. The second is through the instructor's assessment. This informal evaluation takes into consideration the pupil's advances relative to his or her disability throughout the year.

Results from an evaluation of the PLEES project completed after the first year of operation indicated that despite the fact that the program did not begin until at the end of November (with the initial testing not conducted until January), it was successful in attaining its goals and objectives. Seventy percent of the children enrolled increased their ESOL standing on the Pre-IPT by one or more levels (on a scale of 1 to 5). The breakdown was as follows:

Change in Score	# of Children	% of Children
0	9	30%
1	6	20%
2	6	20%
3	8	27%
4	1	3%

In addition, scores on subscales derived from the Exceptional Student Progress Report showed advancement in the areas of reading and math readiness and social/self-help skills.

At Arcola, interviews were conducted with five parents of different children: one child had graduated from the program after two years, one was in her second year, and the others were enrolled for their first year. All parents concurred that they had noticed a remarkable change in their children's English proficiency. All explained that their children understood English much better and agreed, with the exception of one mother whose child has a hearing impairment, that their children's English speaking ability had improved. One mother even admitted that her child speaks better English than she does. The parents offered many examples of their children's pre-reading and pre-math skills, such as recognizing letters, numbers, and identifying their written names. They all stated that their children often talk about what they learned at school when they come home.

At Tropical, interviews were conducted with six parents of different children: two children had graduated from the program after two years, and the others were enrolled in their second year. All parents agreed that their children's comprehension and speaking abilities had greatly improved while in the program (this was true in both languages but particularly in English). They stated that their children can count in English, some up to 20, and that they speak English louder and with more self-confidence. They emphasized that the children are happy at school (they enjoy going there) and that they love the teacher. One woman actually declared that the program completely changed her child's life. She explained that her son spoke only about 10 words in Spanish before he entered the preschool and that now he converses in both languages. She stated that the improvement was 100 percent and that her son even seems happier now.

Follow-Up Evaluations

Fourteen of the children graduated from the program into kindergarten in 1989-90. Nine of these children are in Exceptional Special Education kindergarten, and five are in mainstreamed kindergarten. Of the five in mainstreamed classes, two receive ESOL instruction, and both of them spend only one year in the program.

One kindergarten teacher who had graduates of the program said that the program had helped the graduates considerably. She stated that the learning rate of the children was much greater, because, as she explained, the children already understood the concepts, even if they did not understand all of the English. New concepts did not have to be understood, only the English words. She also indicated that the children understood directions and had no problems interacting with other children.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

The Project PLEES staff is comprised of three full-time employees: the project manager; and two bilingual instructors. All three staff members have received training in the High/Scope curriculum, and all three have been with the project for two years.

The project manager has a Master's in Education Administration of Child Care Programs and has completed the Child Development Associate program. She is currently working toward her ESOL certification. She has six years of experience with Head Start, and she speaks both Spanish and Haitian-Creole fluently.

The Haitian-Creole bilingual instructor has a Bachelor's degree and is currently working towards her ESE and ESOL certification. The Hispanic bilingual instructor has a Master's degree in Psychology and is certified in Varying Exceptionalities. She is currently working towards her ESOL certification. Before the project, she worked for Easter Seals with children from birth to two years old.

In addition to teaching, preparation, and home visits, the bilingual instructors make themselves available for translations and assistance to the parents. Both instructors cited numerous examples of fulfilling requests from parents to make phone calls or to translate letters. The Haitian bilingual instructor said that when she cannot personally meet with the parents to do so, she asks them to put the materials to be translated into the child's book bag, and she calls the parents later. In fact, after our interview, one of the parents asked the bilingual instructor to make such a call for her.

Training

As part of Project PLEES, training sessions were offered to teachers and administrators in the two schools. All of the training sessions lasted six hours, with the exception of one which lasted three hours. All of them were conducted by outside consultants. The topics were:

- ESOL Theory, Strategies and Activities for LEP ESE Students;
- Preschool Assessment Acculturation and Education of Culturally Different ESE Students;
- Cultural and Parent Involvement;
- Instructional Techniques for Prekindergarten ESE Students;
- Creativity;
- Developing Social Language;

- Medically Complex Children;
- High/Scope;
- Developing Language Through Music;
- Feeding and Positioning; and
- Children and Stress.

The range of attendance at these seminars was from 20 to 55 teachers (though at the seminar with 20 teachers there were also 26 paraprofessionals). The average number of teachers in attendance was 38. One of the teachers interviewed stated that these training sessions definitely changed her attitude and understanding of Haitian culture.

Linkages

Parental Linkages

Parents are involved with Project PLEES through home visits, workshops, and classroom visits. As a result of these parental linkages, parents of the children from the program are more involved in their children's education than other parents, according to one kindergarten teacher. Many parents have come back to the preschool teachers even after their children have left the program. The teacher felt that this bond between the parents and the preschool teacher has carried over to her and other kindergarten teachers.

Home Visits. In the first year of the PLEES project, the goal was to conduct one home visit per week to each family. This goal proved to be much too burdensome, and staff have set a schedule of three home visits a year. During each home visit, the bilingual instructors present games, books, and other items to the parents to encourage parental participation in the education of the child. In general, these materials are written in the parents' native language. All parents said they used the materials the teachers left and seemed to feel that the activities and home visits were helpful.

The bilingual instructors' home visits also seemed to have opened dialogue between the parents and the staff. Both bilingual instructors concurred that the parents were more willing to discuss personal and familial problems because of these home visits. This increased dialogue not only contributed to the instructors' understanding of the child's social environment but also strengthened the bonds between teachers and parents. Both teachers felt that this bond contributed to the parents' involvement in their children's education.

Workshops. There were seven parent workshops throughout the 1989-90 project year (roughly one a month). Attendance at these workshops varied with the average being eight parents from each school. The topics of the workshops were:

- Overview of Project PLEES;
- How Children Learn, Let Them Say It;

- Developing Language;
- Your Child's Special Education Needs;
- Parent to Parent;
- Behavior Management;
- Transition into Kindergarten;

All of the workshops were held in the evening, and all were held in the parents' native language.

At Arcola, all of the parents interviewed stated that they attended all of the seven parent meetings held last year (although no parents attended one scheduled meeting because of inclement weather). At these meetings they discussed some of the activities the teachers were doing with the children and things which the parents could do to contribute to their children' education. The topics included educational activities such as story-telling and playing games as well as issues in child health care and parental expectations. The bilingual instructor indicated that many Haitian parents are not aware of the capabilities of their children and consequently expect too little from them. As a result, the children remain unchallenged. One example was a parent who fed baby food to her three-year-old child because she thought that the child's handicapping condition demanded it. The result was that the child had not developed the muscles necessary for good speech and appeared to have a lower level of proficiency than she should otherwise have had. Making parents aware of such issues, increasing their expectations of what their children can do, and encouraging their participation in their children's education were the goals of these meetings.

The same goals may be cited for the meetings for parents of children at Tropical Elementary. (Of the six parents interviewed, four said that they attended every monthly parent meeting (the other two missed only one meeting each). They unanimously agreed that the meetings were helpful and that through these meetings they were much more aware of the extent of their children's problems and their capabilities. Specifically knowing the limitations and capabilities of their children (and what could be done to improve upon them) was what most of the parents appreciated the most from the meetings. They all found the health care issues helpful, but they stressed that the larger benefit lay in the increased communication among parents. The meetings fostered a much stronger community atmosphere, something which all the parents greatly appreciated.

Classroom Activities. All parents from both schools indicated that they visit their children in the classrooms and participate in classroom activities. The Haitian parents said that they participated approximately seven times throughout the year, and one parent, whose child graduated from the program last year, said she was going to become a volunteer this year. The Tropical parents also said that they all had participated in one or more field trips with their children.

Educational Linkages

The administration at both schools clearly supports the project. The district is supportive of the project and shares the expertise of the bilingual and ESE divisions with project staff. Administratively, the project manager reports to the director of curriculum and program development in the Division of Exceptional Student Education. This director, in turn, reports to the executive director of the Division of Exceptional Student Education.

Fiscal Operations

In 1989-90, expenditures for the project from Federal grant money totalled $161,392. This included the $152,000 grant for 1989-90, plus carry-over funds from 1988-89. In 1989-90, personnel totalled $97,563; non-personnel expenditures were as follows:

- Fringe benefits $29,611;
- Indirect costs $7,247;
- Classroom supplies $11,454;
- Office supplies $157;
- Staff Transportation $1,275;
- Purchased Services $2,795; and
- Professional and Technical $11,290.

Future Project Capacity

It seems unlikely that the district will be able to absorb the bilingual component of the project after funds have terminated, though there is a strong possibility that the bilingual instructors will be incorporated as prekindergarten school staff.

The principal of Arcola Lake Elementary indicated that Project PLEES will most likely be unable to continue after the Federal funds are depleted. There is still the possibility of receiving district grants, but the likelihood of that is slim. This was by far the biggest of the principal's concerns, and he recommended that some type of transition funds be instated. He thought that the most important thing to do was to assure the continuance of such a project.

At the same time, the principal related that Project PLEES was the inspiration for another school project, Organization of Parents at Arcola Lake (OPAL). This is a parental organization which is organized to inform parents of educational issues pertinent to their children's education and to generate teacher-parent dialogue. It was specifically designed after Project PLEES' parent meetings and, as it is funded by the school, will continue after the Federal funds for Project PLEES are no longer available.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Both sets of parents and the principal of Arcola Lake Elementary agreed that the strength of the project lay in the dedication of the bilingual instructors. They emphasized the instructors' commitment and availability for counseling, citing the weekly phone calls to keep up with the parents as examples of their genuine interest. The project manager told the story of a parent who got into a row with the authorities and spent the night in jail. To assure the well-being of the child, the Haitian instructor went to the house that night to check up on the child. The Spanish-speaking bilingual instructor, while conducting a round of home visits, once spent 12 hours counseling a parent who was having marital problems. As an indication of some parents' thankfulness for the bilingual instructors' dedication, both instructors have at some time been invited to dinner at parents' homes.

Another successful component of the project was the integration of the parents into their children's education. The persistence of the bilingual instructors in getting the parents involved seemed to pay off. According to bilingual instructors, all of the parents used the materials presented to them during the home visits. As mentioned above, one kindergarten teacher even asserted that the parents whose children were in the program proved to be more involved than other parents.

Major Challenges

The principal of Arcola Lake Elementary indicated that one of the biggest challenges in implementing the project was adapting the teachers to the presence of another instructor in their classroom. Though he stated that the transition was actually quite smooth, he felt that many teachers were reluctant to allow what might be viewed as a competing instructor in their classroom. He attributed the smooth transition to the dedication of all those involved.

Another challenge was the relative intransigence of the parents. Most of the parents were slow to become involved in their children's education, particularly the Haitian parents whose culture, as the project manager explained, believes that the teacher is not effective, if he or she cannot control and educate the children single-handedly.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several recommendations for future bilingual projects were offered by those involved. These include:

- Remaining persistent in incorporating the participation of parents;
- Calling parents once a week to check up on things;
- Helping teachers adjust to the presence of a bilingual instructor in the classroom;
- Informing teachers of the cultural differences between American society and other societies;

- Providing family assistance through social workers; and
- Making sure that there is a committed and devoted staff and bilingual instructor.

Plaza de Niños Bilingual Preschool
Special Populations Program
Kansas City, Missouri

The Plaza de Niños Bilingual Preschool operates as a part of the Guadalupe Center, Inc., a private non-profit agency serving the Hispanic community of Kansas City, MO. The Center offers a number of services to all age groups within this community. For children, services include the preschool, a latch-key program for elementary school students of working parents, membership in a cultural dance troupe, and organized athletics. For adults, programs include ESL and adult education classes, job placement, an immigration program, voter registration, adult recreation, and emergency assistance. For the elderly, a senior center offers a wide range of activities. For the community as a whole, the Center has a crime prevention program. When needed, staff work as liaisons with other social service agencies. The preschool serves low-income working Hispanic parents by providing a bilingual preschool where English-speaking children can learn Spanish and Spanish-speaking children can learn English.

Program Philosophy

The project framework draws from the Nuevo Amanecer curriculum developed by Dr. Gloria Zamora of the Intercultural Development Research Association. Its basic tenet is that children learn best when they are in a setting that respects their culture and language. If children speak Spanish, then this language should be used in their instructional program.

Project Goals

Goals are specified for children, parents, and staff.

Children:	To provide appropriate learning experiences for children that reflect their home language and culture; and To help them make the transition into English without slowing the development of other skills.
Parents:	To involve parents in the learning process of their children; and To facilitate the participation of parents in the activities of the Center.
Staff:	To help staff develop skills in delivering individualized instruction, creating a safe and healthy learning environment, supporting children's cultural identity, and involving parents in the learning process.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

A variety of methods have been used to recruit children:

- Articles in the Center's newsletter to the community, the Barrio Bulletin;

- Conversations with parents who call or visit the Center about other program offerings;
- Announcements on the local bilingual radio station;
- Notices in the local parish bulletins or announcements at Mass;
- Referrals from the public school, local health clinics, counseling centers, the City's staff working with the homeless, the Department of Family Services, and the local resource and referral network.

Word of mouth has been helpful, as well.

At the beginning, it was difficult to recruit a sufficient number of children because parents believed that young children should be at home. Working parents used a family member as a care provider. Over the course of the three years of the project, parents have come to understand that preschool can "educate" children.

A second difficulty has been caused by changing demographics in the city. New immigrants are moving into the northeast, while the Center is located in the traditionally Hispanic west side. Some children are provided with transportation, but project staff worry about children spending too much time on the bus. In addition, there is an Italian agency in the northeast that is expanding its offerings to Asians and Hispanics. It is more convenient for parents from the northeast to go there.

Though there is no specific recruitment of LEP children, all children are initially screened for language proficiency upon entry into the program. Parents are asked nine questions regarding the language(s) spoken in the home by the parent, child, and other adults. In the first two weeks of class, teachers observe the child's use of language to determine which language is more comfortable for the child to speak. Using parent and teacher data, staff decide on the appropriate first language of instruction for the child. Spanish-dominant children are taught in Spanish during circle time; English-dominant children are taught in English.

Enrollment

The project enrolled an average of 50 children in each month of its first year of operation and a mean of 55 in each month of subsequent years. The percentage of children who were considered LEP varied across the years, from a low of 24 percent in 1989-90 to a high of 40 percent in 1988-89. The percentage of English-only children ranged from a low of 18 percent in 1989-90 to a high of 27 percent in 1990-91.

Year	Total Enrolled	# LEP	% LEP	# EO	% EO
1988-89	50	20	40%	10	20%
1989-90	55	13	24%	10	18%
1990-91	55	18	33%	15	27%

Retention

Plaza de Niños has experienced considerable turnover in children. In 1988-89, 85 children were enrolled for at least one day. Twenty-eight of them (33 percent) completed the entire school year (October to June). In 1989-90, 33 of 75 children (44 percent) completed the year.

There are several reasons for the high turnover. The major reason is financial. Parents must pay a fee for children's attendance. When they lose a job, it is not possible to continue to finance preschool. A second reason is that parents often choose to vacation in Mexico and take their children out of school. There may not be a slot open when they return. A third reason is that a family may lose eligibility for Title XX because of a child's lack of attendance. They need that subsidy to afford preschool.

Schedules

The preschool program operates for 10.5 hours per day, five days a week, 52 weeks a year. Children may begin the program at the age of two, if they are toilet-trained, and may remain until they reach school age. The six groups in the program average about nine children per class. They meet in two large rooms in a converted parochial elementary school building, one room houses two groups of two- and three-year-olds, the second, four groups of four-year-olds.

The program opens at 7 a.m. with free play and then a snack. For the younger children, the morning continues with

- Circle time for 15 to 20 minutes, when the theme is presented in the child's native language. Some visual aids or materials are used to help introduce the theme.
- Discovery centers for about an hour, when children disperse to one of seven classroom areas to work/play, and then clean up.
- Art/music/physical education for about 40 minutes, generally a whole-group activity.
- Lunch for a half-hour, served in a cafeteria in the basement of the building.
- Story time for 15 minutes, when children together listen to stories.
- Outdoor play for 20 minutes, generally on the playground next to the building.
- Naps and free play until parents arrive.

The four-year-olds generally follow this schedule but have a second circle time in the morning, a snack after nap time, followed by a chance for outdoor play, and an additional hour of work time inside.

Instructional Strategies

The schedule for the day allows for the use of multiple teaching and learning strategies. All children in a room (the 14 enrolled in the younger class and the 42 in the older class) gather together for story time. Smaller groups are constructed for circle time, learning centers, and the art activities. Children organize their own groups or play independently on the outdoor playground.

Grouping. Children are grouped for circle time according to their native language. This grouping is maintained throughout the year, but no other grouping (e.g., by ability in a language) is used, and grouping by language does not occur during other activities.

Curriculum. The Nuevo Amanecer curriculum is used for all age groups. The materials suggest themes to use throughout the year such as body parts, weather, culture, animals, safety, numbers, professions, and colors. The teachers have created portfolios for each theme with suggestions for activities. In general, the themes are repeated each year, but the activities change.

Language Usage

Both English and Spanish are used in the classroom by teachers and children. Most of the children are native English speakers, so this language predominates. However, Spanish is used in the classroom in several ways. First, one of the groups for circle time is Spanish-speaking. The teacher and children in that group have Spanish as their dominant language. It was used exclusively in our observation of the first circle time in the morning, though some English was used with this group during the second circle time. Spanish predominates for this group throughout the year. The theory is that these children will learn English in play with other English-speaking children, and that circle time in Spanish provides a support and legitimacy for their language and culture. Second, all of the other groups are taught Spanish. For example, in circle time activities with fruit, teachers introduced the Spanish and English words for the various fruits. Third, the Head Teacher speaks almost exclusively Spanish. All children are, thus, exposed to a speaker of Spanish.

Classroom observation. On the day we observed the four-year-old class, the first circle time involved children sitting at tables with their teacher or aide, learning about the theme of foods:

- At the first table (the Spanish-speaking table), six children sat with one teacher and two aides. They made orange juice using a juice press. The teacher discussed the process in Spanish; children watched.

- At the second table (English-speaking), eight children sat with one teacher. The teacher introduced in English the activity of taste-testing. Children tasted different foods.

- At the third table (English-speaking), six children and an aide engaged in cutting out pictures of foods from magazines.

- At the fourth table (English-speaking), seven children colored a ditto-sheet showing the outlines of different fruits; they were supervised by an aide.

At least one teacher or aide directed each activity in the discovery centers, generally speaking English with the children. Children returned to their original groups for the second circle time, supervised by the same teachers and aides, using the native language of the children once again.

Materials and Equipment

The space and furnishings were appropriately arranged for preschool classrooms. There were cubbies for children's storage of personal belongings, child-sized tables and chairs, and open shelves for the storage of some materials. Learning centers were set up throughout the space with easy visual supervision. Though a rug covered the floor, there was little in the way of furnishings for relaxation and comfort. For example, there were no upholstered chairs or soft materials, and there was no place for children to be alone. The rooms appeared somewhat barren, with considerable empty space and few displays. Disney characters were painted on the walls extending close to the high ceilings, but there was little in the way of commercial materials or teacher-made displays about food (the current theme), and little in the way of children's work.

The classrooms were well equipped for cognitive activities and motor development. A number of children's books were on display; picture lotto was available; a record and a tape player were at the teachers' desk; size and shape toys and sorting games were on the shelves. For gross and fine motor development, beads, puzzles, and blocks and building toys were in evidence. There was sufficient room and equipment for energetic activity in the classrooms and outside.

Interestingly enough, there were some limitations of the materials on display. All of the books and most of the displays were in English, though the teachers said they had books in Spanish. The stories were generally about white children; there did not appear to be concern about showing a broad spectrum of children, either in terms of race or gender.

The classrooms had little equipment for creative activities. For example, there were no easels and paints, play dough or clay, musical instruments, dance props, or sand and water play areas and toys. These were classrooms set up for instruction by teachers, and teachers brought out such materials in support of the day's activities. The materials were not continuously available for children.

Non-Instructional Services

The two primary services provided in support of the preschool project are transportation for children who need it (about 10 to 15 at any given time) and meals. All children receive a morning snack, lunch, and an afternoon snack. The Center supplies transportation, paid for partly from project funds; and the Child and Adult Care Food Program finances meals for 40 of the 56 children currently enrolled.

Additional services available to participants include all those provided by the Center (listed in the introduction), health assessments funded and provided by the school district, a program for homeless families, a food pantry for USDA commodities, and referrals, as needed.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Children are evaluated in several ways. In terms of standardized inventories, children are given the Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS) and the Denver Developmental Screening Test at the beginning of November and in the spring. A team of testers comes from the school system and tests all children. (The Director tests children entering later in the year.) Spanish-dominant children receive the Spanish language version of the Pre-LAS; others are tested in English.

Three evaluation tools are provided as a part of the Nuevo Amanecer curriculum: the Language Profile, which supplies the initial assessment of language dominance; the General Weekly Report, which summarizes for parents the child's activities, mood, and learning for the week; and the Master Checklists, which summarize the personal skills, social skills, language skills, and gross and fine motor skills of children on a quarterly basis. The Weekly Report is completed and sent home each Friday; the Master Checklist is completed once a quarter and forms the basis for discussion in a parent/teacher conference.

In the 1988-89 school year, children showed considerable development according to these measures. From the Master Checklists, it was determined that

- 69 percent were at age level or above in language development in English;
- 63 percent met these criteria in personal and social skill areas; and
- 53 percent had mastered appropriate fine and gross motor skills.

From the Denver Developmental Screening Test, 78 percent were at age level in all areas; only 9 percent (two children) showed delays in more than one area. From the Pre-LAS, results showed that 70 percent were functioning at or above their chronological age.

Data are not available in the evaluator's report specifically about the LEP children in the program, so we cannot say whether they are among those functioning at the appropriate level in English language skills.

Follow-up Evaluations

Children from the Plaza de Niños project attend a variety of kindergartens. Many enroll in a local Catholic school; others attend a variety of public schools. The local elementary school is not a neighborhood school, but is a magnet school for Spanish and communication. Its Spanish immersion program is open for non-native speakers; its partial immersion program is open to all. A few graduates of Plaza de Niños attend, but many are dispersed around other City schools.

The Catholic school does not test incoming children and does not conduct a standardized testing program for older elementary school students. The local magnet school had only four graduates of Plaza de Niños and did not keep track of these individuals as a group. The teachers at both schools said that Plaza de Niños children were well adjusted and that their skills were far ahead of children who had had no preschool experience. They seem to have "had more experiences than other children and were able to talk about them."

Staff

Characteristics and Roles

The Plaza de Niños staffing allows for a Director, one Head Teacher, two or three teachers (depending on enrollment), and three aides. In the 1989-90 school year, a part of the Director's salary, and all of the salaries of the Head Teacher, two teachers, and two to three aides were paid for through the Special Populations Preschool Grant. The third teacher and one short-term aide were paid for by parent fees; two short-term aides were paid for by Department of Family Services funds. These staff are assisted, when possible, by "abuelitas". During our observation, two abuelitas were present, one paid for by the Foster Grandparent program and authorized to work with one or two children at a time and, the other funded through the Senior Community Service program of AARP and able to do whatever is needed.

Teachers and aides have similar roles in the classroom. Each of these adults designs and directs activities for one group at circle time, supervises a discovery center during these activities, and directs art, music, and physical education activities. The differences between staff members are described as differences in level of responsibility. The Head Teacher reviews the curriculum plans from all teachers and aides. The teachers have the responsibility to see that their classrooms operate well. Aides must submit curriculum plans for approval and are supervised within the classroom setting.

The project experienced 100 percent turnover of staff during the 1989-90 school year; no teacher or aide ended the year in the same position as she began the year. The Head Teacher left in May and was replaced through the promotion of one of the teachers. An aide was promoted to replace that teacher. The second teacher left in April; a new hire finished the year. A third teacher was hired in May and completed the year. The aides followed a similarly mobile pattern.

The Director believes that the turnover is primarily due to the low wages paid to staff. One aide moved to the school system for better pay. One teacher had a baby and did not feel it was worth it financially to return. A second reason for turnover is a lack of dedication to the profession; two aides were asked to leave because of this issue. The Director reports considerable difficulty in finding staff qualified in early childhood education.

The Director, Head Teacher, four of the five 1989-90 teachers, and three of the six aides were Hispanic and spoke Spanish as their native language. The other teacher and one aide were white (not Hispanic), had English as a first language, but also spoke Spanish. The other two aides were Hispanic with English as a first language and Spanish as a second. So, all employees could converse with the children in Spanish and English.

None of the 11 teachers and aides employed in 1989-90 had any previous training in early childhood education. Three of the teachers had certification in elementary education from other countries and had worked in elementary schools, two as classroom teachers and one as an ESL instructor. The other three teachers had each worked for two years in day care. One aide had worked previously as an aide in an elementary school; three aides had some experience in a preschool; two aides had no previous preschool or school experience.

Because this is a program for the children of working parents, parents do not volunteer in the classroom on a regular basis. They participate in the education of their children in other ways.

Training

Several staff development opportunities were provided in 1989-90 through the Center or the project itself. The topics and attendance of classroom staff were as follows:

- CPR: 4 hours, five teachers and two aides;
- Child abuse: two sessions for a total of 1-1/2 hours, five teachers and two aides;
- Children of dysfunctional families: five hours, one teacher;
- Nuevo Amanecer, planning, and nutrition: 3-1/2 hours, three teachers and four aides.

In addition to all of the above, the Director attended a six-hour child care conference, a four-hour session on the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and a seven-hour session of Title VII.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

When parents enroll their children in Plaza de Niños, they sign a contract promising, among other things, to attend at least three of the four yearly meetings of the Parent Advisory Group. At these meetings, project staff introduce themselves, talk about opportunities for children and parents, and discuss and plan ethnic festivals and special community events. Several actions are taken to facilitate parent participation: child care is provided; the meetings are set right after work; and the meetings are kept short. Project staff feel these meetings have empowered parents, giving them a sense of ownership and control.

Parents are scheduled to attend at least two parent-teacher conferences at school. In the current school year, these conferences will occur quarterly. The teacher prepares the Master Checklist, summarizing each child's skills, and discusses the child's progress with parents. Three to four parents also assist on the 12 to 15 field trips taken by children each year.

The project also sponsors several parent workshops during each year. In 1989-90, the topics included an introduction to early childhood education, nutrition, parents as teachers, and AIDS. About 15 parents attended each session.

Additional activities for parents are provided by the Center: GED classes; ESL classes; citizenship classes; and a family reading class.

Educational Linkages

Because Plaza de Niños operates under the auspices of an independent agency, rather than a school system, there are no inherent organizational linkages between the project and local schools. The project had to create linkages.

Linkage with the Kansas City School System is accomplished primarily through the Bilingual Coordinator in the school district who also serves as the Project Director of their Title VII project. She is the liaison for Plaza de Niños with the school system, helps coordinate training, may provide a parent workshop, organizes standardized testing, provides referrals to the project, and generally, answers questions about bilingual curricula, consultants, or other issues.

Community Linkages

The Guadalupe Center is a community center, offering a wide variety of programs for children and families. It is strongly supported by numerous community agencies and staff:

- Two businesses (PayLess and Kansas City Power) have "adopted" the agency and help with its physical upkeep and the purchase of supplies and equipment.
- Two local schools have "adopted" Plaza de Niños children;
- An Hispanic labor group provides resources and equipment;
- University of Kansas nursing students each visit the program for two days, observing on the first day and presenting a lesson on the second;
- St. Theresa's requires community service for all of its high school students, many of whom help in the Plaza de Niños classrooms or on field trips; and
- Eight individuals from South America who are students at Penn Valley College help at the Center on an on-going basis and learn English.

Fiscal Operations

The Special Populations Preschool Program funds about 35 percent of the operation of Plaza de Niños. In 1989-90, the funding amount was $85,997, spent primarily on staff compensation. The next largest income ($68,600 or 28%) is from parent fees. If no transportation is required, the fee is $42.50 for five days a week. The remaining funding and its distribution is as follows:

- Child and Adult Care Food Program: $10,800, for food and food supplies;
- Department of Family Services (Title XX): $20,500, for aides and utilities;
- United Way: $20,457, for utilities, transportation, and management;

- Contributions: $14,694. materials and equipment, upkeep; and
- Kansas City: $24,375. Director and Secretary.

Future Project Capacity

Beginning next year, a grant from the Kaufman Foundation will continue the funding of this project. The Guadalupe Center will become a "family center" and will gain case workers to deal with individual families. This grant may be larger than the current Federal grant, and will ensure the ability of the project to continue and possibly to grow.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

The major contributors to the success of the project seem to be that (1) it is operated through an established agency in the community; (2) it uses a tested and valuable bilingual curriculum; and (3) the teachers and aides work well together.

Major Challenges

The difficulties faced by project staff include recruiting and retaining qualified individuals as teachers and aides, locating and maintaining sufficient cash for a quality operation, and getting parents involved in the education of their children and in advocacy for bilingual programs.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The principal recommendations concern staff training and development: try to provide staff training before the project begins and, from the beginning, dedicate a certain number of hours each year to staff development. Second, choose a good curriculum. Nuevo Amanecer has been invaluable as a tool of bilingual education. Finally, develop an appropriate testing program and good tracking forms for children's development. Choose assessment tools that relate to the curriculum. Use tracking forms that discuss where children are starting out, how they progress, and where they are when they leave.

Community School District 32
PROJECT B.E.E.P.
Brooklyn, New York

Project B.E.E.P. (Bilingual Education Enrichment Program) is serving LEP Spanish-speaking children in two elementary schools (P.S. 274 and P.S. 377) in Community School District 32 located in Bushwick, Brooklyn. The district is located in a low-income, transient, densely populated urban community, with a high crime rate and heavy drug trafficking. Approximately 70 percent of the population is Hispanic (initially Puerto Rican, but in the last two years there has been an influx of people from the Dominican Republic, and most recently from Ecuador and Central America), with the remainder primarily Afro-American. There are also Asians (Korean and Chinese), Haitians, Indians, and families from Arabic-speaking countries in the district. Sixteen languages have been identified in the district including Arabic, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Korean, and Farsi. Children speaking other languages are served through the district's ESL program. The schools in which the project operates, like the other schools in the district, are old and overcrowded.

Program Philosophy

The overall design of Project B.E.E.P. is based on research literature in bilingual education and early childhood education. It is also based on the research findings of the Project Coordinator, Dr. Blanca Vazquez. Her research compared children from two schools with preschool programs within the district--one with bilingual services, the other with no services. Her findings indicated that if a child's native language is developed, that child will be better able to transfer skills into a second language. The program was therefore designed to develop Spanish language proficiency to accelerate the learning of a second language.

The program is also based on the belief that parents are the first teachers of their children. It was designed to educate parents at the same time that their children are educated.

Project Goals

The project goals reflect the three components of this project.

Parents: To encourage the active participation of parents in the education of their children;

To involve parents in schoolwide activities; and

To educate parents through workshops, seminars, ESL instruction; and native language literacy instruction.

Children: To foster language development and literacy in Spanish that will accelerate the learning of English;

To foster cognitive development;

To develop an understanding of concepts about themselves, others, and the world around them; and

To foster socio-emotional, physical and aesthetic development.

Staff: To provide staff development through inservice training, conferences, workshops, consultations by supervisors, etc. that enables teachers to have a current/extensive knowledge of early childhood research and curriculum.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

A variety of strategies are utilized to recruit children to the project. These include:

- Posting flyers in day care centers, churches, Department of Health clinics, and other community agencies;
- Sending information home with older siblings;
- Word of mouth;
- Bilingual resource teachers soliciting parents when they bring their children to school;
- In the second year, soliciting Spanish-speaking LEP children from the roster of those children who registered for the New York City-funded prekindergarten program, Giant Step, that operates in P.S. 274 and P.S. 377; and
- Placing articles about the project in the local Spanish language newspaper Noticias del Mundo once the project was in operation.

After application to the program, children are selected based on two screening devices. First, children are observed in a play activity. The project recruiters choose those children who lack age-appropriate socialization, language, and behavior skills. Second, a Home Language Information Survey Form, a standard form mandated by the New York City Board of Education is administered to parents upon enrollment. This survey enables project recruiters to determine the level of English language proficiency of the family. Those with the least proficiency in English are selected for Project B.E.E.P.; the others are candidates for other preschool programs.

The project met with some difficulty in recruiting participants during the first year of operation. Parents preferred Giant Step, a New York City-funded monolingual prekindergarten program, which was already in operation in the two school sites selected for Project B.E.E.P. and had a wealth of resources. In addition, there was some reluctance by the parents to enroll their children in a bilingual program where the emphasis is on speaking Spanish. They feared that their children would not learn English. However, by the second year of operation, parental fears were dispelled through support for the project from parents whose children had participated.

Enrollment

Project B.E.E.P. enrolled 60 Spanish-speaking LEP children in each year of operation. Half the children were served at P.S. 274 and half at P.S. 377. The children, age four, were all below the Federal poverty level, based on Federal free lunch applications. All the children were Hispanic, with backgrounds from Puerto Rico, Peru, Ecuador, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Panama. Children who were not enrolled in the program were placed on a waiting list. Last year at P.S. 377, 30 children were on the waiting list.

Retention

Families in District 32 are highly mobile. The Puerto Rican population often moves back to Puerto Rico for extended periods of time. Other families move in and out of the neighborhood seeking places to live or employment. Because of this mobility, several children entered and left the program each year without completing the full year. In 1988-89, 83 percent of the children completed the program, while in 1989-90, 79 percent completed the program.

Schedules

Classes at each school are organized in two sessions. A morning session is offered for one group of children and an afternoon session is offered to another group of children five days per week, 40 weeks per year. The average group size is 15 children. The morning program operates from 8:40a.m. to 11:00a.m. and the afternoon session operates from 12:35p.m. to 2:50p.m. One teacher and paraprofessional are assigned to both sessions at each school. Children remain in the program for one year before entering kindergarten.

A typical afternoon schedule for each half-day session includes the following activities. The morning schedules are comparable.

- Arrival -- informal conversation among children, between children and teacher; children put belongings away;
- Lunch -- conversations among children and between children and teacher, discussion of foods; children clean up after themselves;
- Circle time -- reinforce previous themes, introduce new themes;
- Work/Play period -- develop language, thinking, problem solving, classification, esthetics skills through blocks, table toys, pretend corner, art center, listening center, science center, etc.;
- Story time -- develop listening, reading, and language skills;
- Music/movement and/or indoor/outdoor play -- develop large and small muscles through running, jump rope, rocking boat, etc.;
- Evaluation -- What did we do today? What will we do tomorrow?;
- Dismissal -- children get belongings.

The daily schedule of activities observed and noted in teacher lesson plans was developmentally appropriate for this age group. The time allocated for each activity on the day observed was sufficient. Children were encouraged to finish their projects; teachers reinforced this by alerting children to "transitional" periods between activities. Since this program operates on a half-day schedule, teachers had to be completely attuned to time. A tremendous amount of activity/planning occurred in a very short time span.

Instructional Strategies

The objective of Project B.E.E.P. is to provide LEP Spanish-speaking children with early childhood experiences that will ultimately lead to English language proficiency. The program adheres to the accepted approach to developmental teaching/learning for this age group. The project staff and coordinators are able to coordinate the developmental approach with bilingual objectives/goals. This is important to note since from a developmental approach the objective is to teach the child one skill in any given activity that can be integrated by the child and then translated into a variety of activities/tasks. With the bilingual component, two skills are being taught simultaneously with appropriate reinforcement by staff and absorption/integration by children.

Curriculum. To achieve the project goals, the curriculum focuses on the physical, social, and intellectual development of language and multicultural concepts and skills through a variety of intradisciplinary experiences. Language arts, science, social studies, mathematics, and music are an integral part of each day's activities. The curriculum is based on the New York City Board of Education Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Curriculum Guide, Three, Four, Open the Door; the Teacher's Guide to the Foundations for Learning: A Full Year Program for Young Children; Beginning English Through Action and ALERTA Handbook; and materials developed by the bilingual resource teachers and coordinator.

Various themes are introduced during the course of the year. For example, children engage in a science unit focusing on sinking vs. floating for approximately one month. Children make paper boats, experiment with sinking and floating objects, go on a field trip to the beach, discuss sounds and smells of the ocean, and compare them to the sounds and smells of the street. Other themes involve holidays (Thanksgiving, Christmas, Election Day, Veterans Day, Easter, Pan American Day, etc.), colors, the self, school, and community.

The children in Project B.E.E.P. follow the same curriculum as other children in the prekindergarten classes in the school. They have multicultural activities including songs, cooking, etc. Field trips are coordinated to encourage the feeling among participants that they are part of the school and community and to acquaint the children with various educational sites.

Instructional organization. Various types of learning activities are introduced throughout the day. At the beginning of the day, all children are grouped together for circle time. During this time, language development is fostered through children sharing information. They may talk about the weather, what they are wearing, count the number of boys and girls who are present, etc. The teacher also uses this time to introduce a subject and reinforce a particular theme. For example, if the theme for the day is the color green, children will be encouraged to go to a particular learning center and focus on the theme. They may paint using the color green, or engage in a science activity related to frogs.

Children then move into various learning centers where they may spend from 20 to 30 minutes. The children generally select the centers where they would like to work and play. The teacher and paraprofessional move among the centers, providing individualized instruction on an as-needed basis. There is no grouping, either by language or other abilities.

Field trips are an important learning activity. Last year, Project B.E.E.P. classes went on 11 field trips. In the fall, they go pumpkin picking at Green Meadows Farm. Other places include the New York Aquarium, Big Apple Circus, Noticias del Mundo Newspaper Office, the Planetarium, the Museum of Natural History, and the Brooklyn Public Library. The project staff has indicated that these trips are the best way to engage parents in class activities.

Language Usage

Children's language facility. Children's facility with English varied over the course of the years. Spanish had been the dominant language in the first year of the program (none of the participating children had any English), while in the second year, more English fluency had been observed. In this third year, teachers noted that more children had equal fluency in the two languages, and those children with dominant Spanish had some understanding/speaking ability in English. The teacher at P.S. 274 indicated that three out of 30 children spoke/understood English; at P.S. 377, 10 out of 30 spoke/understood English at the time of the observations. Of the total number of participants, three children were not understandable in either language.

Classroom observations and interviews. Observation of both classrooms participating in Project B.E.E.P. occurred near the beginning of the school year when Spanish was still the more dominant language. According to teachers and paraprofessionals interviewed, Spanish was spoken exclusively for the first few months of the year (100% of classroom time), with occasional introduction of specific English words for specific situations. No one particular Hispanic dialect was dominant, so children were exposed to different idiomatic phrases and words. The Spanish language was reinforced through songs, dances, stories, etc., as well as through general classroom conversation/activities. Children were encouraged to speak primarily in Spanish, even those who had some fluency in English. This was done by immediately translating words used in English to Spanish and asking the child(ren) to repeat them.

English was introduced initially (25% of classroom time) during circle time activities, story telling, and music and was later incorporated into conversational classroom time (50% of classroom time). As more English was used for specific situations, teachers focused on giving children the correct word and usage in both languages (e.g., bailar - to dance, "Vamos a bailar, let's dance"). All teaching in both languages was within the context of the activity and was consistently reinforced during the activity. In the classroom observations, it was clear that English was introduced by the staff person most comfortable with the language. For example, at P.S. 274, the paraprofessional was born and raised in the U.S. by Puerto Rican parents and had retained complete fluency in Spanish. Her English was excellent compared to the teacher and, therefore, her activities were more bilingually oriented. The paraprofessional at P.S. 274 indicated during her interview that her approach to the children was more bilingual (and was, in fact, more English dominant) because she felt that sole emphasis of Spanish was not "fair" as the children would then be tested in English at the next grade level. Although the introduction of English earlier in the year seems to be a personal objective of the paraprofessional, the teacher in the classroom appeared to agree and allowed the paraprofessional to use solely English during a portion of the circle time activities.

The use of English did not seem to bother any of the children. They did not seem to be confused by the use of English; all children were able to follow directions given in English. Some had difficulty in responding in English. In such a case, the paraprofessional asked the same question in Spanish, which the child answered in Spanish. The paraprofessional then gave the answer in English and asked the child to repeat it. Both teacher and paraprofessional in each classroom seemed very comfortable with this learning approach. All staff were able to use both languages interchangeably, some with more ease than others.

The observations of the two B.E.E.P. classrooms (P.S. 274 and P.S. 377) showed that approximately one-fourth of the participating children spoke English rather fluently. Children spoke to each other in English phrases with Spanish included as needed. They seemed comfortable in changing languages when words were not known. As this observation occurred after the Halloween holiday, children were overheard speaking about "teenage mutant ninja turtles", particularly as they looked at the photo bulletin board!

Reinforcement of language skills in any language was clearly the focus of the teachers. Conversation was continuous and was a reflection of the activity or the interest of the children. During lunch, discussion of food served was bilingual with emphasis on manners, food names and ways of expressing satisfaction, (example: delicioso - delicious, "Que delicioso esta la hamburguesa!" "This hamburger is delicious!"). Project staff stressed that both languages were spoken equally by teachers and children by the end of the year.

Materials and Equipment

Materials observed in each classroom were developmentally appropriate. Commercial materials included posters, calendars, and learning aids, while teacher-made materials helped present children's work; bilingual signs denoted activity/learning centers. Games, both commercial and teacher-made, were bilingual and age appropriate (in effect, these games did not require expressive languages skills in either language, but were more oriented to conceptual skills and receptive language).

Each classroom was bright, cheerful, and spacious. Each was well furnished with new child-sized tables and chairs, adequate open shelving, cubbies and rug areas. Learning/activity centers were appropriately set up, and materials included in each area were attractively displayed. There was an ample supply of blocks and other building materials to foster small motor development. Outdoor equipment was limited, and children shared the resources of the other prekindergarten program. Classrooms appeared to have sufficient supplies of art materials, instruments, and props to enhance creative play.

Non-Instructional Services

Various non-instructional services are provided to project participants, some of which are not specifically funded by the project. All of the support services provided by the school through state and local funds, such as guidance counselors and nurses, are available to Project B.E.E.P. participants. State funds also provide free lunch to all of the children in the project. State funds, in conjunction with the project funds, provide health and social services information. These are primarily through parent workshops offered by the project on such topics as nutrition, child abuse, AIDS, lead poisoning, etc. In addition, the bilingual resource teachers, funded by the project, provide referrals to parents for a variety of community services. They also help translate for parents, attend school-related meetings with them, and have even assisted in employment searches for some families. Project funds support transportation for field trips.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Teacher observations and standardized inventories are the assessment instruments used to evaluate participant progress. Language development is assessed through pre- and post-test scores on the Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS), which measure children's expressive and receptive language abilities in both Spanish and English.

Test results from the 1988-89 project year indicate that in both English and Spanish oral language performance, children who participated in the program performed significantly better on the post-test. The district established a control group against which to measure the oral language achievement of the Project B.E.E.P. participants. Thirty prekindergarteners from P.S. 384 who participated in the bilingual tax levy district program were also pre- and post-tested with the Pre-LAS. The control group of 30 children was compared with 30 children randomly selected from the B.E.E.P. classes. The results of test scores indicate that, although the control group performed significantly better than the experimental group in the pre-test for both Spanish and English, the difference not only disappeared in the post-test condition, but the B.E.E.P. group performed consistently and significantly better than the control group.

Teachers also observed children during classroom activities to gauge child progress in school readiness skills such as fine and gross motor coordination and to measure their adjustment to the school environment. They maintained anecdotal logs for each child. These logs demonstrate the significant progress children make during the year.

Parents expressed surprise at the language skills acquired by their children. Obviously, skills in English were more evident to the parents, particularly since very few of the parents had any English. But parents also commented on Spanish language skills. In addition, parents mentioned an increase in the degree of independence evidenced by their children as they participated in the program.

Follow-Up Evaluation

Children entering kindergarten are pretested with the English version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). This test was developed by the New York City Board of Education to measure the English language proficiency of non-native speakers of English. Test results are used to determine whether a child's level of English proficiency is sufficient to enable that child to participate effectively in classes taught in English. It measures listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills. Until last year, if a child scored below the 20th percentile on the pretest, that child was placed in a bilingual/ESL class. Those who scored above were placed in monolingual classes. Last year, the cut-off point on the LAB was changed to the 40th percentile. Any child scoring below the 40th percentile is now placed in Bilingual/ESL classes.

Children who completed the B.E.E.P. program last year could be placed in one of several types of kindergartens. There are regular bilingual and monolingual kindergarten classes at each school. There is also a state-funded Two Way Bilingual Program referred to as Project B.E.B.E. (Bilingual Education Benefits Everyone). This is a three-year program (kindergarten through second grade) in which there is a Spanish-dominant and an English-dominant bilingual class. Children who scored below the 40th percentile last year were placed in the Spanish-dominant class. In 1989-90, 42 children were placed in a bilingual kindergarten, 15 of them in Project B.E.B.E. Twelve children were mainstreamed; one of them was placed in the English-dominant Project B.E.B.E. class.

Kindergarten teachers indicated that children from project B.E.E.P. are making excellent gains in their Spanish language acquisition and speak in full grammatical sentences. In addition, they are making gains in English. Children who came from a monolingual program are not as fluent in English and are speaking more "Spanglish". Kindergarten teachers also indicated that Project B.E.E.P. children appear to assimilate what they are learning, have good eye-hand coordination, know their shapes, follow directions, speak more, and are more self-confident than children who did not attend a prekindergarten program.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

Project B.E.E.P. is staffed by the project director, two bilingual teachers, two Hispanic paraprofessionals, and two bilingual resource coordinators. The teachers are native Spanish speakers, each with approximately 10 years experience in early childhood education. They each have Bilingual Common Branch licenses and are salaried through tax levy funds.

The paraprofessionals are fluent in Spanish but are English dominant. They have early childhood experiences in prekindergarten through third grade. One paraprofessional has 10 college credits, while the other has an Associate's Degree. They provide supplementary reinforcement instruction for each child. Paraprofessionals observed at P.S. 274 and 377 are totally integrated as part of the educational team in each class. In P.S. 274, the paraprofessional takes charge of the circle time activities. If the paraprofessional is engaged actively with the children, the teacher prepares for the next planned activity. Both teacher and paraprofessional circulate in the room during free choice time assisting children or making general comments about the different activities. Paraprofessionals also maintain anecdotal records on the children and contact the home if a child is absent for several days.

The two Hispanic bilingual resource teachers are responsible for staff development, adult literacy classes, and parental workshops. They also function as advocates for the parents. For example, they write letters to social agencies for the parents and help them with translations or paper work when necessary. They have played a key role in involving parents in the project.

The classroom teachers have been with the project since it began. One bilingual resource teacher left after the first year to take a position at Long Island University. The other bilingual resource teacher started in January of 1989, after a replacement had been found for her position in the talented and gifted program in the district. There has been some turnover among the paraprofessional staff.

The project is administered by the coordinator of Title VII programs for Community School District 32. She works closely with the bilingual resource teachers in the planning of teaching objectives, instructional activities, and parental workshops. The Title VII coordinator reports to the district's bilingual supervisor who, in turn, reports to the director of the Multilingual Center. The district's bilingual supervisor, the coordinator of Project B.E.B.E., and the ESL coordinator work with the project, as needed.

Parents and grandmothers serve as volunteers in the classrooms. Volunteers were in the classrooms during our observation as "extra hands". Those volunteers were not necessarily parents of children participating in this year's class. In fact, two of the volunteers stated that their children had participated in the project in the previous year. During the observations, parents helped by carrying the lunches (served family style) from the cafeteria, bringing them to the classroom, and setting up lunch tables.

Training

Staff development is an integral part of this project. The objective is to enable teachers and paraprofessionals to have a current/extensive knowledge of early childhood research and curriculum. Curriculum development and child development are the two key areas around which workshops and training activities are planned. In 1989-90 at least 13 workshops were provided to staff. Topics included such themes as understanding children's behavior through the use of the video, fun with blocks, preparing learning centers, and multicultural education. Most workshops are funded through the project; however, some are funded through the state. In addition to the project teachers and paraprofessionals, other district teachers and paraprofessionals also attend. Some state-funded workshops such as the one on "English and Me" are attended by staff throughout the city. Project staff also attend monthly workshops given by Giant Step.

Monthly workshops are held for paraprofessionals. The topics are generally determined by the needs of the paraprofessionals. Recent workshops have included working with small groups, communicating with teachers, and keeping anecdotal logs. In addition, the bilingual resource teachers provide on-going training through classroom observations and follow-up recommendations.

Linkages

Parental Linkages

There is an extremely strong and active parent component in this project. Parents serve as classroom and school volunteers, are responsible for the lending library, participate in parent workshops, attend monthly parent advisory committee meetings, and attend ESL and native language classes. The bilingual resource teachers are credited for achieving such active involvement. Once parents become involved in the school, they continue to remain active even after their children are no longer in the program. As one kindergarten teacher commented, on the first day of class this year a former B.E.E.P. parent approached her and asked "What can I do for you this year?"

Parent involvement is having a positive effect on the parents. They have a better self-image, a better understanding of the school system that enables them to participate actively in school meetings, are more assertive about having their needs addressed, and are better able to interact with the teachers. In addition, they are expressing a desire to learn.

Many of the parents who have participated have expressed interest in improving their status and that of their children. They indicated that they would like to have GED as well as ESL classes at the school. Although GED classes are offered in the community, it appears that having classes on-site makes it much more conducive for them to attend.

Classroom activities. Parents are encouraged to participate in field trips and other activities such as holiday programs. Those with particular skills (e.g., art, music) are also asked to contribute to class time either by presenting an activity to the class or preparing the materials to be used in the class. Parents occasionally prepare native dishes and serve them at lunch time. They also prepare native dishes that are characteristic of their Thanksgiving and Christmas celebrations. These activities reinforce the multicultural environment fostered by the project.

Lending library. Parents are responsible for the lending library (lea me un cuento/read me a book program) maintained in each classroom. This program is a major focus of the overall goal of Project B.E.E.P. Parents are encouraged to check out a book daily and read to their child in the evening; parents also take home an activity sheet giving them questions to ask their children about the book, space for them to write down their child's response, and space for the child to color or draw what he or she remembers most about the book. This program reinforces all the appropriate learning objectives for this age group, while also strengthening parental participation and cooperation within the program. During parent interviews, this program was highlighted as one of the more satisfying aspects of the project.

ESL instruction. The bilingual resource teachers at each school provide ESL instruction to project parents and other LEP parents two mornings each week for approximately two hours. Initially it was difficult to get parents to attend, but the resource coordinators are very persuasive. They often greet parents in the morning before school starts to encourage them to attend classes. Once parents have been exposed to the program, they tend to continue classes. Several parents attending ESL instruction during the site visit had children in kindergarten, but they had begun the classes when their child was in Project B.E.E.P. To encourage attendance in the ESL classes, and reward parents for participation, project funds are used to purchase bilingual dictionaries for the parents.

Native language instruction. The Title VII coordinator offers Spanish language literacy instruction to Hispanic parents, including those in the B.E.E.P. project. These classes are offered during school time at another public school in the district.

Parent workshops. To help educate the parents, both in working with their children and in understanding broader child-related issues, the bilingual resource teachers organize various workshops during the school day. The workshops are conducted by school district staff, Project B.E.E.P. staff, other community agencies such as the Department of Health, organizations such as the Hispanic Child Abuse Task Force, and parents in the community. Topics have included lead poisoning prevention, how to help your child in reading at home, helping your child through gymnastic activities, and discipline and child abuse prevention. Thirteen workshops were held from January through June 1990. To ensure good attendance, parents are encouraged to bring their younger children to the workshops. Refreshments are offered to both parents and children. At the time of the site visit a hands-on math work-shop was provided which was enthusiastically received by the parents. Parents applauded at the end of the workshop and requested that it be continued the following week. Several B.E.E.P. parents and former B.E.E.P. parents were in attendance.

Educational Linkages

Project B.E.E.P. is an integral part of Community School District 32 and P.S. 274 and 377. Several positions in this project are funded directly through tax levy funds, including the two prekindergarten teachers and the director of the Multilingual Center. The project is also well coordinated with other bilingual programs, such as Project B.E.B.E. in the district.

Project participants have access to all of the services, equipment, and facilities at each of the schools. Administrators are highly supportive of the project and work closely with project staff. Cumulative records are forwarded to kindergarten teachers and project staff discuss individual children with the kindergarten teachers. There appears to be excellent communication between the teachers of Project B.E.E.P. and the kindergarten teachers at the schools. At the beginning of the year project teachers speak with the kindergarten teachers about individual children and how to work best with those children. Communication continues throughout the year.

Fiscal Operations

In 1989-90 Project B.E.E.P. received a federal grant of $304,421. More than half of the funds were allocated to pay the salaries of project staff (the bilingual program coordinator, two resource specialists/teacher trainers, two paraprofessionals and one secretary).

Grant funds were allocated as follows:

ITEM	AMOUNT
Personnel	$165,984
Fringe benefits	62,213
Travel	2,800
Supplies	40,944
Contractual (evaluation consultants)	5,000
Other (postage, telephone, local travel, admissions, parent involvement, transportation)	8,900
Indirect costs	18,580
TOTAL COST	**$304,421**

The federal grant is heavily subsidized by tax levy funds. Classroom teachers, school administrators, and the director of the Multicultural Center are all salaried through tax levy funds. Additional personnel not supported by the project include the dietician and the cafeteria staff, two family assistants, the janitor, guidance counselor, and directors of other bilingual programs in the district who have assisted in the project's implementation.

Non-personnel costs supported through the district include classroom space and utilities, food and kitchen supplies, classroom supplies, testing materials, office supplies, and parent activities.

Future Project Capacity

District staff are hoping to continue the project after federal funds are no longer available. The district has highlighted native language instruction as a means of providing equal educational opportunities for all children. The Project B.E.E.P. program interfaces with the district's Two Way Bilingual Program, providing four years of bilingual education for participants. However, funding for the project is a concern. The Mayor of New York recently cut $90 million from the New York City Board of Education budget. In addition, the state's budget deficit is resulting in further cuts to the city's education budget.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Several factors have been identified as contributing to this project's success. One key element has been parental involvement. Parent workshops have been beneficial in enabling parents to reinforce at home the learning that takes place in the classrooms. The bilingual resource teachers have been instrumental in involving parents in the project. They relate to the culture and language of the parents and are supportive of the parents in a variety of ways. As separately funded positions, without classroom or other administrative responsibilities, they have a flexible schedule to solicit parent support and address parental concerns and needs.

The dedication of the teachers also contributes to the project's success. Not only are they the instructors, but they serve as referral sources for the parents. The untiring efforts of the teachers can be summed up by one parent's comment to a teacher "Do you live in the school? Where is your bed"?

Finally, the multicultural nature of the activities introduced in the project enhance the self-esteem of both children and parents. Parents feel good about the fact that their cultures are recognized through songs, foods, holidays, heritage days, etc.

Major Challenges

Project staff encountered three major obstacles in implementing and operating this project. The first was persuading parents to enroll their children in the program. Many parents preferred to enroll their children in Giant Step, which was an established program that appeared to have extensive equipment and materials. In addition, some parents were concerned that if their children were enrolled in a bilingual program, they would not learn English.

The second challenge was to get parents involved once they enrolled their children. The bilingual resource teachers indicated that once they could get them to attend workshops, the parents recognized the benefits and continued to attend.

The third challenge is space. While each of the classrooms are adequate, there is no other space for the project to operate. Workshops are given in the lunch room, and therefore are limited in the hours in which they can be given. Meetings between teachers and parents are held wherever there may be a free room on a particular day. There is little outdoor space for the children to play.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several recommendations were offered for bilingual preschool projects that may be just beginning. They include the following:

- Involve parents in the project from the beginning;
- Increase the parent involvement component and offer opportunities for parents to come in the evening;
- Fund a position such as the bilingual resource teacher that provides a flexible schedule to work with parents and teachers;
- Provide funds for outreach such as a family assistant who can make home visits, telephone calls, etc., if parent/child is absent;
- Provide guidance services to families via a social worker, or workshops in such areas as self-esteem, career education and values clarification; and
- As in this project, have teachers who are well qualified and can relate to the culture and language of the project participants.

Oaks Mission Bilingual Preschool Project
Oaks, Oklahoma

The Oaks Mission Early Childhood Program in Oaks, Oklahoma is a three-year project currently in its third year of funding. The participants are predominately American Indian three- to five-year olds, many of whom speak English as a first language but tend to test below their age group because Cherokee is the language of the home. The preschool and kindergarten are housed in a separate building on the rural district's single campus. Both preschool and kindergarten are under the aegis of the project director, although the kindergarten program is funded by the school rather than Title VII funds.

Program Philosophy

This program builds on the children's native language and culture to bridge the gap between a Cherokee upbringing and the American school system. Regardless of the background of the participants, developmentally appropriate instruction is the central premise of the program.

Project Goals

Original project goals, addressing needs of children, parents, and teachers, have been maintained throughout the project implementation:

Children:	To develop the limited English proficient (LEP) children's English language skills.
	To provide an environment which fosters all aspects of development.
	To provide a program that will improve the ability of the preschool children to cope with the school environment.
Parents:	To develop and improve English language skills so that parents might reinforce the efforts of the project.
	To modify parental attitudes regarding the need for a higher level of education.
	To help parents improve their parenting skills.
Staff:	To provide preservice and in-service training for staff in language arts development for LEP children.
	To provide an opportunity for educational personnel to participate in higher education certification programs which address the needs of LEP children.
	To provide a Child Development Associates (CDA) certification program for aides.

As the project has developed, several new goals have emerged:

To connect the school and home by bringing native culture into the school.

To develop awareness of different Indian customs (as members of different tribes join the program).

To develop casual use of Cherokee in peer conversations rather than academic mastery of the language.

From the perspective of the district staff and teachers in the receiving school, the intent of the project is to develop language-based and school readiness skills so that these children are on or above grade level by the time they enter first grade.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

Although formal means are used to publicize the project--posters in community areas, newspaper advertisements, and announcements at community meetings--all parents in the sample interviewed first heard about the project from friends or coworkers. In addition, because the community is so small, the director is able to find parents at local events, discuss the project informally, and invite the parents to preview the classes. A slide show at the elementary school's final award ceremony also is used to inform parents of the early childhood program.

According to the project director and the superintendent, every three- to five-year-old child in the district is eligible to participate in the project. Up to this point, applicants have not exceeded project capacity, so all interested students may enroll.

Enrollment

In the applications for funding, the Oaks Mission school estimated that 80 to 84 children would be served each year. Enrollment was somewhat lower than anticipated. Initially, parents were unsure of the value of the new project, although visible growth in participants' skills later reassured the parents--several of the parents interviewed enrolled their children only after seeing friends' children make remarkable progress in the program. Competition from the nearby Head Start program, which has begun accepting three-year-olds this year, may have produced the current drop in applicants. The following chart describes actual enrollment for the three years:

Level	**1988-89**	**1989-90**	**1990-91**
Prekindergarten	39	37	32
Kindergarten	32	43	30
Total	**71**	**80**	**62**

Most of these students were at least part Cherokee, although tribal affiliation has diversified over the past three years. Eighty-five to 93 percent of the students were LEP; 42 to 52 percent were from families below the federal poverty level.

Retention

In the first two years of the project, five to seven students left the program without completing the year because their families moved from the community. Because there are few job opportunities in the area, many families are forced to move to locate work. To ensure that interested non-transient students remain in the program, the school provides transportation and the teachers and director maintain frequent telephone and written contact with the parents.

Schedules

Participants attend school from 8:30a.m. to 3:00p.m. five days per week throughout the school year. They arrive early, at 8:15a.m., for the school-provided breakfast. Children may participate in the program for up to three years, until they are old enough to attend first grade.

Instructional Methodologies

The program is designed to develop the children's English language and social interaction skills at the children's level of performance. The language experience approach, focusing on productive and receptive language skills, is the main theoretical emphasis.

Learning centers. The major instructional approach in the classroom is the use of learning centers. Children are encouraged to select centers in which to work and provided guidance on an individual level. They may change centers whenever they want. The following centers are set up in the two preschool classrooms:

- The home center;
- The Cherokee center;
- The reading center;
- The blocks center;
- The math center;
- The science center;
- The audio-visual center; and
- The flannel board center.

Learning centers in the kindergarten are more academically oriented: language, math, art, writing, science, social studies, and motor. Use of the centers is also more structured--each student spends about 20 minutes in each center.

Small group instruction. In the morning, small groups of five or six students do different activities such as making clay beads or Indian bread with the teachers and aides. Activities change from day to day. As with the learning centers, students are free to join and leave groups at their own volition.

Large group instruction. The whole preschool class gathers several times each day: early in the morning to review topics such as days of the week, colors, numbers, and the pledge of allegiance and to sing songs and listen to stories; after lunch to listen to a story; and just before going home, to share the events of the day.

Grouping. Although groups often develop around activities and learning centers, the preschool students are not placed into groups using any specific criteria. Kindergarten students are placed in groups for reading lessons, depending on each student's mastery of the topic of the day.

Curriculum. The curriculum is not based on a single model but incorporates a number of approaches. Themes depend on the children's interests and have included: dinosaurs, circus clowns, bears, volcanoes, and space. These topics are changed from year to year to ensure new material for second- and third-year participants.

Every fall and spring the early childhood project has a full-day festival. Past themes include: Mexican fiesta, Hawaiian luau, and a nursery rhyme production. The project tried to celebrate a Cherokee holiday with a festival one year, but parents felt that this was a cultural intrusion, so the festival became a Mexican fiesta instead.

Language Usage

Most of the children in the Oaks preschool project are identified as limited English proficient. However, all of the students speak some English; for many, English is their first language. Their proficiency is limited by the use of Cherokee in the home.

Classroom observations. In the classes observed, the teachers and students spoke English almost exclusively. On occasion, the bilingual aides held short conversations with individual students in Cherokee. However, the project director pointed out that in the Cherokee culture it is considered rude to speak Cherokee in the company of non-Cherokee speakers. As all of the teachers and some of the children do not know Cherokee, it is not surprising that very little Cherokee was spoken in class. During the site visit, several classes made Indian fry bread. Although many of the students apparently knew the Cherokee word for fry bread they were reluctant to say it in class, even when encouraged.

Materials and Equipment

The materials and equipment in the classrooms address five key areas:

- Room arrangements are conducive to learning: The learning centers and equipment (i.e., child-sized furniture) are appropriate for three- to five-year olds, but soft areas (i.e., a sofa or rug) are lacking. Displays are mainly child- and teacher-developed, with some commercial materials.

- Materials provide language/reasoning experience: Books and tapes/records provide receptive language experiences in English but not in Cherokee. The staff says that Cherokee materials are simply not available. Games and toys to develop reasoning abilities are available.

- Equipment and materials promote motor activities: Beads, puzzles, blocks, and other materials enable participants to develop fine motor skills. Gross motor skills can be developed through play in the large indoor and outdoor play areas and with outdoor equipment such as the climber, swing, and slide.

- Materials are available for creative activities: Materials for art, music, and movement activities are accessible, as are blocks and sand/water areas.

- Environment and materials promote social development: Neither classroom provides space to be alone. Except for the Cherokee center, displays and materials are not deliberately multi-racial or non-sexist; the environment and materials are not, however, particularly racist or sexist.

Non-Instructional Services

Several non-instructional services provided to participants are funded by sources other than the project. The district supplies breakfast and lunch to all children daily, and transportation for most students. Once a month, the school counselor comes to the class to perform a skit or other activity. The school system provides a speech pathologist and handicapped specialist on an as-needed basis, and the county health department offers health services through the Indian hospital.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Participant progress is evaluated with teacher observation and standardized inventories. Observations are recorded regularly and a checklist is completed on a quarterly basis.

Four standardized inventories are administered on a pre- and post-test basis. Inventories currently being used are:

- Missouri Kids, which evaluates school readiness in academic and motor skills;
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), which measures receptive vocabulary;
- Test of Early Language Development (TELD), which evaluates expressive language skills; and
- Miller Assessment for Preschoolers (MAP), which measures English language proficiency and sensory-motor abilities.

Missouri Kids replaced the Head Start Battery because staff felt that the former is easier to score and to discuss with parents. Students are given a month to adjust to school before being tested, and are tested again at the end of the school year. All testing is conducted in-house: the project director, teachers and aides are trained to administer one or more of the four tests.

According to the observation checklists, students made progress in academic skills such as learning the alphabet and colors, and social skills such as sharing. On the standardized tests in FY 1990, students gained at least one Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) and as much as 35 NCES between the pre- and post-tests. Highest grades were achieved on the Missouri Kids gross motor and the MAP Preschool total scores. The lowest scores were achieved on the PPVT. The project director and the teachers pointed out that the tests were not always indicative of talent, as these students have little to no prior experience in testing situations.

Follow-Up Evaluations

Because the school district does not have special services for LEP children beyond the early childhood program, all graduates from the bilingual kindergarten are mainstreamed in first grade. In essence, the first grade is comprised of students from the early childhood program.

All students in first grade are tested with the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) and the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT). Because these tests are not administered in prekindergarten or kindergarten, progress of each student is not tracked with these standardized inventories. However, comparison of test results for successive years indicates that students who attended the early childhood program have scored higher than those who attended no program.

On a more informal basis, first-grade teachers have noticed a difference between students who have attended the early childhood program and previous classes which did not have that option. Graduates of the early childhood program are better prepared for school: they are more receptive of teachers, more aware of rules, more comfortable playing with others, and more talkative. One first-grade teacher commented, "I don't know what to do with them. They know all the skills I used to have to teach."

Staff

Qualifications

The project staff consists of a project director/parent trainer, a project secretary, two full-time prekindergarten teachers and four full-time prekindergarten paraprofessionals. Although financed by the school district, the two kindergarten teachers also work under the direction of the project director. The paraprofessionals assist the prekindergarten teachers by developing materials, reinforcing ideas, and working with small groups of children. A brief description of teaching staff characteristics and qualifications follows:

- Teachers: BA in education, early childhood, or elementary education certification, five years early childhood education experience.
- Paraprofessionals: Child Development Associate Certificate, high school diploma, native Cherokee speaker, five to fourteen years early childhood education experience.

There was some staff turnover: one teacher left the project after the first year to start her own day care center. When selecting teachers, critical characteristics were early childhood background and certification and ability to communicate with parents. For paraprofessionals, a high school diploma and the abilities to speak Cherokee and to get along with children were key.

Parents and older students serve as volunteers. About three times each week a parent assists in each classroom. Volunteers to chaperon field trips could almost outnumber student participants if staff allowed it. High school students work with the children individually and help clean the school building.

Training

Three of the project goals concerning staff training have been realized: continual in-service was coordinated for the staff; prekindergarten teachers have become certified in elementary education; and the four aides have earned Child Development Associate Certification.

Thirteen in-service training sessions were offered during the 1989-90 school year. Topics included:

- Developmental Stages of the Child
- Games for the Classroom
- Discipline and Self-Esteem
- Curriculum development
- Big Books, Predictable Stories
- Simple Science
- Whole Language
- Moving with Success
- Games and Activities for the Bilingual Classroom
- Learning Centers for the Bilingual Classroom
- Dinosaurs in Class
- Volunteer Program
- Vocabulary Comprehension

Many of these training sessions were provided by the project through Northeastern State University: professors from the university visited the school once a week to conduct two and one-half hour in-service training sessions for college credit. These classes were open to other district teachers; kindergarten and first-grade teachers were especially encouraged to attend. Two other training sessions, Learning Centers and Games/Activities for the Bilingual Classroom, were sponsored and provided by the Bilingual Multifunctional Resource Center at the University of Oklahoma.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

The early childhood project has gradually developed a cohesive parent component. The project director pointed out that parents tend to participate regularly when initially assigned tasks; very few volunteer from the onset. She attributed this reluctance to parents' distrust of the new program.

Parent workshops. Parent workshops are generally responsive to the needs of the parents, as voiced through the parent advisory council. Several popular "make and take" workshops at the school enabled the parents to create materials for their children. In addition, some parents took a volunteer workshop in Tulsa.

Advisory council. A group of seven parents meet four times each year to suggest topics for workshops and ideas for the biannual preschool festivals. Parents remain on the committee as long as their children participate in the early childhood program. The project director noted that this group has become more vocal and assertive as the parents gain confidence in the program and the importance of their input.

Parent-teacher interaction. The parents communicate with the teacher and/or director at least once a week through notes, telephone calls, or conversations when picking up their children. Teachers meet with the parents every nine weeks to discuss the children's progress; again, few parents participated when this was done on a volunteer basis, but most parents come to assigned conferences. Most parents help with the class at least once a year, working in small groups in the classroom or washing cot sheets; a few parents volunteer every day. For big events such as the spring and fall preschool festivals and the field trips, almost all of the parents help prepare materials or chaperon.

Educational linkages

The Oaks Mission School District is responsible for the building which houses the project, including utilities; transportation; and breakfast and lunch. District personnel, including the custodian, special education counselor, school counselor, and principal, provide all supportive services available through the regular school program.

Communication between the early childhood project and the elementary school is strong. First grade teachers have access to the early childhood project's student files. In addition, the small campus and communal outdoor playground enable preschool, kindergarten, and first grade teachers to share impressions of the children's development regularly. The project director noted that these frequent conversations, coupled with elementary teachers' participation in the project's in-service training, removed the mystique from the early childhood project and enabled all the teachers to develop and work toward common goals.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

Aside from the in-kind contributions from the school district, all aspects of the project have been financed by the Title VII Special Populations Grant.

Future Project Capacity

Funding for this early childhood project will terminate in June 1991. The program is expected to continue operating in the same capacity, although the source of funding is not yet determined. The district operates on a low tax base because most of the land in the area is federally owned; without additional support, it would be difficult for the district to fund the preschool further. The district is currently applying for a two-year Special Populations

Continuation Grant, and investigating funding through the Cherokee nation and a new state education program.

Aside from financial concerns, the project has developed a structure to facilitate continuation. The early and continual training of program staff will support the district's ability to provide a professional preschool program, regardless of future funding for training. Most staff members are young and have families; they are committed to remaining in the area and working with the project. In addition, the project has established strong bonds of teachers and parents working together and a good transition between preschool and elementary school.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Staff in the project and district recognized a number of key elements that have been essential to the success of the project, including:

- Opportunities for children to express thoughts, build self-esteem, and do hands-on work;
- Opportunities provided through the project that the children cannot get elsewhere;
- Friendly atmosphere: the staff works together like a family;
- Good staff and staff pride in the project;
- Indian staff working with new Indian students;
- Parental involvement: "If you have involved parents, then you're going to have kids who are excited"; and
- Good communication with the receiving school.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Many of the factors which have made this project successful can be used to develop other projects:

- Hire staff with certification in early childhood and bilingual education;
- Hire good assistants who can encourage without condemning, and hire a good director: "Your staff are the people who make it go";
- Train assistants well;
- Maintain good communication on all levels of the project;
- Help parents understand how the project works, and have them participate;
- Offer variety to the students; change centers often; and
- Set up the classroom to allow the child to choose activities, so that educational activities can be presented without undue pressure.

Hidalgo Independent School District
Early Childhood Bilingual Education Program
Hidalgo, Texas

The Early Childhood Bilingual Education Program serves low-income, predominantly LEP Spanish-speaking, Mexican-American children in two elementary schools (Kelly Elementary and Hidalgo Elementary) and in a home-based program in the Hidalgo Independent School District. The district, located in southwestern Texas, serves a rural community one half mile from the Mexican border. Family income is primarily derived from agribusiness; 60 percent of the families are migrant workers who remain in the Hidalgo area from October to March.

Prior to the receipt of the Title VII Special Populations Preschool grant, Hidalgo operated a prekindergarten program for four-year-old children. The Title VII grant permitted extensive curriculum development efforts to benefit this program and allowed the development of a home-based program for three-year-olds.

Program Philosophy

The design of this curriculum development project is based upon research literature in early childhood education and bilingual education. The framework for the prekindergarten curriculum consists of materials from the Early Childhood Standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Early Childhood Essential Elements provided by the Texas Education Agency, Title VII Academic Excellence Projects, the Head Start Bilingual Early Childhood Model, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's Follow Through Model, and the Texas DLM Beginning Milestones Program. It also incorporates the cognitive approaches of such child development experts as Bruner, Piaget, Bloom, and Bronfenbrenner.

The program is based on the belief that parents must play an active role in the education of their children. It is designed to educate parents at the same time as their children are educated, enabling them to develop good parenting skills and promote the academic success of their children.

The project consists of two programs: a four-year-old program that employs a school-family model with a full-day school curriculum for children and parental support; and a three-year-old program that uses a home-family model with the home as the educational center and the family as instructors. The objectives of the four-year-old program are to prepare LEP children cognitively and affectively for success in the kindergarten program and to integrate the four-year-old curriculum with the existing elementary school curriculum. The focus of the three-year-old program is to train and utilize parents to develop cognitive and affective skills at home with their children so that children will be better prepared to benefit from the prekindergarten experience.

Project Goals

The goals and objectives of this project include the following:

To provide prekindergarten children with a structured skills development curriculum;

To acquire English language proficiency and build upon native language proficiency;

To enhance the instructional skills of teachers and aides;

To promote parental involvement and participation in the instruction of their children; and

To involve three-year-olds and their parents in the early childhood program.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

Participant recruitment for the school-based program is shared by the district and project staff. Families are informed about the project through school newsletters sent home with older siblings, and through parents whose children are already enrolled in the project. Names of potential candidates for the project are provided through Head Start and through the local Education Service Center. If parents do not register their eligible children for classes, one of the project's Family Resource Coordinators will visit the home to inform parents about the project and encourage them to participate. The project staff also arranges parent conferences to discuss the program and encourage registration.

Recruitment has been problematic in that parents of children with some English fluency wanted an English-speaking environment where their children could become more proficient in English. To address their concerns, the Project Director invited experts in bilingual education to speak with parents and assure them that once their child is educated in his/her native language and concepts are acquired, that learning will facilitate the child's ability to learn in English. Not all parents agreed. In the 1990-91 project year, parents placed pressure on the Principal of Hidalgo Elementary School to create a separate classroom for their English-dominant children. Project staff indicated that the children that parents define as "English-dominant" understand commands in English (e.g., come here, sit down), but are not actually fluent in English; they need a bilingual program. But the Principal created such a prekindertarten class to be conducted in English, operated outside of the Title VII grant.

Recruitment for the three-year-old home-based program is the responsibility of the Family Resource Consultants who live in the community. Recruitment for the first year was difficult. Some names and addresses were provided by Head Start and the schools if there were older siblings, but for the most part, the family resource consultants conducted a house-to-house survey to identify all three-year-olds living in the district. They explained the project to the parents of all eligible candidates and encouraged their participation. They also collected from these parents the names and addresses of other potential candidates. In the second year of the project less field work was required as more parents learned about the project through word of mouth.

Enrollment

The initial project proposal estimated that 200 children would be enrolled in this preschool project; however, enrollment has been considerably lower. About 60 percent of the families in the area are migrants making it difficult to obtain an accurate number of children who require preschool services. At present, the project is only serving LEP children, however, in previous years, English-dominant children were also served. The project accommodates all children who want to be served; there are no waiting lists. Project enrollment over the course of the years follows:

	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Total Enrolled	119	131	132
Number LEP	100	114	132
English Dominant	19	25	0

In addition, the project has identified 55 three-year-olds and is currently serving 38 of these children and their parents.

Retention

Families in the Hidalgo ISD are highly mobile. In addition to the migrant workers, many families have established two residences, one in Mexico and one in Hidalgo, and frequently move from one to the other. They usually remain in Hidalgo during the growing season and return to Mexico afterwards. Many families also leave for an extended visit to their families in Mexico. In 1988-89, 91 children (76 percent) completed the program while in 1989-90, 79 children (60 percent) completed the program.

Schedules

Participants at each school attend a full-day program from 7:45a.m. to 2:45p.m., five days per week. Parents generally bring children to the school between 7:15a.m. and 7:30a.m. for a breakfast snack. The actual instruction begins at 8:00a.m. A typical full day schedule includes the following components:

8:00a.m.	-	8:25a.m.	Communication/Sharing
8:25a.m.	-	9:25a.m.	Cognition
9:25a.m.	-	9:45a.m.	Motor Development
9:45a.m.	-	10:00a.m.	Break
10:00a.m.	-	10:45a.m.	Language Development/ESL
10:45a.m.	-	11:15a.m.	Lunch
11:15a.m.	-	11:45a.m.	Communication/Story Telling
11:45a.m.	-	12:45p.m.	Rest Time
12:45p.m.	-	1:00p.m.	Break
1:00p.m.	-	1:50p.m.	Fine Arts
1:50p.m.	-	2:05p.m.	Social Emotional Development
2:05p.m.	-	2:35p.m.	Free Play
2:35p.m.	-	2:45p.m.	Closure -- What did we learn today?

The average group size of each of the six classes is approximately 20 children. The number varies during the course of the year as the population is very mobile. A teacher and an instructional aide are assigned to each class.

Instructional Strategies

The objective of this Early Childhood Bilingual Education Program is to provide LEP Spanish-speaking children with an educational experience that will allow them to transfer successfully to an English language program by the second grade. The program emphasizes the development of cognitive skills, oral language proficiency, and a positive self-image.

Curriculum. The four-year-old curriculum provides for a full-day instructional program with emphasis on language development and cognitive skill development. The project director, the district curriculum consultants, the prekindergarten teachers, the educational psychologist, an early childhood specialist, and an outside curriculum consultant developed the 16 curriculum units. Each unit contains six learning strands: Language Development/English as a Second Language, Cognition, Communications, Motor Skills, Fine Arts, and Social-Emotional. The curriculum is composed of the following units:

Unit 1 Orientation to School
Unit 2 Body Parts
Unit 3 Self-Awareness
Unit 4 Family
Unit 5 Food
Unit 6 Clothing
Unit 7 Community
Unit 8 Community Helpers
Unit 9 Transportation
Unit 10 Toys
Unit 11 Weather
Unit 12 Domestic Animals
Unit 13 Plants
Unit 14 Zoo Animals
Unit 15 Measurements
Unit 16 Dinosaurs

Each of the 16 units is designed to be taught over a two-week period, and consists of 10 lessons; a reteach lesson, in which the same concept is taught in a new way; and an evaluation lesson, in which the teacher informally evaluates the children to assess whether they have mastered the concepts of the unit. The curriculum emphasizes ESL and English language development throughout. Communications skills development is emphasized in objectives and classroom activities, and teachers concentrate on oral skills in the native language. Whole language applications are incorporated throughout the curriculum. School readiness and social skills are also emphasized. The children's cultural heritage is reinforced through holidays, preparation of native dishes, songs, and stories.

Each lesson is very structured and tells the teacher precisely how to teach the concepts to the children. The lessons all have an objective, materials, resources, procedure, reteach, and enrichment components. The curriculum provides for classroom activities that, while developmentally appropriate, are highly structured and academically oriented. Academic learning is emphasized by teachers and the principal as a means of helping children succeed in school in the future. The Early Childhood Coordinator, however, is aware of the need to incorporate other developmentally appropriate learning activities.

The curriculum was finalized through a series of classroom field tests and revisions. Teacher feedback was essential in determining what worked best. For example, initially there was a review lesson instead of the reteach lesson, but teachers found that this was boring for the children and replaced it. An enrichment component was added to each of the lessons for those children who were developmentally ready to engage in the activity.

Instructional organization. Although a variety of instructional strategies are introduced through the curriculum, the primary form appears to be whole group instruction. The communication, motor development, and social/emotional strands are taught through whole group instruction. The Language Development/ESL strand initially begins with whole group instruction, but during the course of a 45 minute period, the class divides into small groups in learning centers (e.g., listening, math, reading). The cognition and fine arts strands involve small group activities. Individualized instruction is provided on an as-needed basis. This is most evident during the reteach lesson where not every child needs to be retaught the whole concept.

The classes take approximately three to four field trips per year. They have gone into MacAllen, the "big city" seven miles away; the zoo in Brownsville; the fire station; and the park. Parents accompany the children on the field trips.

Language Usage

Children's language facility. Children have very little facility with English at the beginning of the year. Most children understand simple commands but their fluency in English is minimal. The Early Childhood Coordinator indicated that the children have been exposed at home to English through television. Their facility with Spanish is also limited because their parent's vocabulary is limited and their sentence structure is not always grammatically correct.

The classroom teacher attempts to expand the children's Spanish vocabualry by speaking only Spanish in the classroom at the beginning of the year. The content area of the curriculum is taught only in Spanish, with the exception of the 45 minutes devoted to language arts/ESL. The teacher fosters Spanish fluency through repetition. Children are asked to repeat words and phrases introduced through the curriculum units. Group activities and other games are also in Spanish.

In addition to the ESL curriculum, the only other English used is commands for children (e.g., come here, sit down). As children become more proficient in English and as vocabulary increases, more English is introduced. At the time of the site visit (December) all instruction was still in Spanish. By the end of the year, English comprehension has risen to a level where approximately 25 percent of the content area is taught in English. The children's ability to speak English, however, is more limited, even at the end of the year.

When children enter kindergarten, instruction is again completely in Spanish, because they tend to forget the English they learned over the summer.

Classroom observations. During the site visit an ESL lesson was observed that revolved around a discussion of clothing and colors. Children sat in a circle in a large group. The teacher asked "What are these?" "Que son estos?" Children responded in Spanish and were given the English words by the teacher. The lesson continued with a game in which children passed a flash card (Button, Button...) and one child sat in the middle. At the end of a rhyme, the child holding the card had to answer a question. The children's spontaneous responses were in Spanish. When coached by the teacher, the children were able to use English words, but they did not do so under their own volition.

Later in the day the class was observed working in small groups on a clothing unit. Only Spanish was used. Six children were working on clothing frames (e.g., buttons, zippers, snaps) with no teacher supervision. They were actively involved, exchanging frames and talking to each other in Spanish. Another group of seven children were using flash cards with the teacher and discussing "how we dress and brush our teeth." The third group was working with the aide looking at large photographs of different weather scenes. They were discussing what children were wearing for different kinds of weather. At one point a child, seeing a photograph of a rainbow, used the English term. The aide restated it in English, but did not ask the children to repeat it in English. She asked what it was called in Spanish. When no one answered, she told them the word and asked them to repeat the word in Spanish.

Materials and Equipment

The six classrooms are all equipped with developmentally appropriate materials. Bilingual materials are visible and used by teachers and children. Information for parents explaining the use of each learning center is available, helping parents to understand the objectives being achieved in early childhood education when they saw children only "playing".

One classroom at Hidalgo Elementary has a more "academic" orientation than the others. Desks are in rows and equipment, which is developmentally appropriate, is covered with curtains and not readily visible to the children. This classroom teacher was "brought down" from the higher elementary grades. The early childhood coordinator plans to spend time with this teacher to help her create a classroom geared more appropriately for preschoolers.

The four teachers at Kelly Elementary work cooperatively in the classrooms, sharing materials and assisting with classroom presentations. All rooms are attractive; bilingual signs are evident, and ample equipment is available in the manipulatives and art areas.

Although all rooms have commercially produced material available, little of the children's work is visible. An excellent series of "big books" in Spanish is available in several rooms. There are few cultural displays and books in the classrooms.

The Kelly program has a separate prekindergarten outdoor play area while Hidalgo uses the elementary school playground. Ride-on toys, tricycles, etc. are not available at either school due to lack of storage space and theft. The early childhood coordinator indicated that new purchases will be made next year. Sand/water play areas are not visible in any of the classrooms.

Hidalgo Elementary is a slightly older school than Kelly Elementary. Space, particularly outdoors, is somewhat limited. Indoor space is sufficient at both schools and on the whole efficiently and attractively used. At neither school are classrooms equipped with upholstered furniture and there is little space for children to be alone.

Non-Instructional Services

Project participants are provided with the same non-instructional services provided to all district children. A full time guidance counselor and nurse are available. Vision, hearing, and dental screening are also provided. The children from Kelly Elementary School receive free bus transportation and 90 percent of all the children in the project receive free lunch. Teachers often help parents complete forms and explain various social service programs, etc. to them.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Placement

Children are classified for instructional purposes on the basis of their home language and their English and Spanish oral proficiency. Parents complete a Home Language Survey upon registering their children for school and all children are given the Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS). Basically, there has been little variation across children in English language proficiency; all speak little or no English at the beginning of the school year.

Participant Progress

Test results on the Pre-LAS are reported in the form of "level" scores, which range from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The 1988-89 test results indicate that the average prekindergarten child gained one level in English and .8 level in Spanish during the year moving from 1.2 to 2.2 in English and from 3.3 to 4.1 in Spanish. Similarly, the 1989-90 test results indicate a mean English gain of .9 (from 1.5 to 2.4) and a mean Spanish level gain of .6 (from 3.5 to 4.1). Children in Hidalgo Elementary showed greater gains in English than children in Kelly Elementary, while the children at Kelly Elementary showed greater gains in Spanish than the children in Hidalgo. This probably results from the fact that Hidalgo provides more English language instruction for the Spanish-dominant LEP children who know some English while Kelly utilizes a transitional bilingual education model for children who are primarily Spanish monolinguals.

In 1988-90, the project measured developmental skills through the Prekindergarten Achievement Inventory (PAI), a locally prepared instrument that uses a variety of developmental skill items obtained from the Brigance and the Beginning Milestones materials. The teachers administered the test in whatever language was appropriate for the child. By the end of the year, children mastered an average of 89.4 percent of the developmental items, exceeding the expected 75 percent mastery level. In 1989-90 this test was replaced by the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI), a nationally norm-referenced test based upon a national sample of Head Start children. This test assesses a variety of verbal, visual, physical, and mental skills. Results of the pre- and post-tests showed that children significantly improved their developmental scores in both English and Spanish. Children improved their English language scores 34 percent and their Spanish language scores 26 percent. Children improved on the CPI English version from the 4th percentile to the 38th and on the CPI Spanish version from the 72nd to the 95th percentile.

A Teacher Screening Questionnaire, prepared by the Educational Psychologist, was administered in 1988-89 to identify children in need of special assistance (e.g., referral to school-health agencies, counseling). The assessment identified difficulties in expressive language, ability to tie shoe laces, and physical problems related to hygiene and nutrition. These results indicated the need for a variety of support services and "remedial" activities for the 49 children who showed deficiencies in these areas.

Project staff and teachers prepare an end-of-unit test every two weeks to evaluate each child's mastery of the unit concepts. This provides feedback to the teachers regarding deficiencies in the curriculum and an opportunity to reteach those areas in which children perform poorly. End-of-unit tests administered in 1989-90 showed a high level of mastery of language and developmental skills. Sixty-four percent of the items tested were mastered. Unit tests are currently being revised to achieve more reliable scoring of some items in the units.

During parent interviews, mothers noted an increased use of individual English words which indicated to them that children were "learning" and not just playing. Mothers also noted improvement in behavior. One parent indicated that she had learned from her child how important it is to be polite to family members as well as outsiders; "My child says we should say please and thank you to each other." This social skill was important to the parents who viewed it as an integral part of the project's goals.

Follow-Up Evaluation

Approximately 79 percent of project participants entering kindergarten in 1989-90 were placed in the bilingual kindergarten. The remainder were placed in the ESL kindergarten. Similarly, approximately 78 percent of the participants entering kindergarten in 1990-91 were placed in the bilingual kindergarten with the remainder placed in the ESL classroom.

As a follow-up, project participants in kindergarten were compared with non-project participants in oral language proficiency and reading. Results of the English IDEA Oral Proficiency Test showed that project participants had greater oral English language proficiency than non-project participants (mean of 2.2 levels vs. 1.6 levels, with a t-test value beyond the .05 level of probability).

On various English and Spanish Reading index scores were developed by district staff that project participants had slightly higher scores than non-project participants. In Spanish Reading, project participants scored 3.9 vs. the 3.7 scored by non-project participants. In English Reading, project participants had mean level scores of 4.1 compared to 2.7 for non-project participants. The kindergarten teacher indicated that children come to her with pre-reading skills. By mid-year, they are reading in Spanish and, by the end of the year, several are reading in English.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

The Hidalgo Early Childhood Bilingual Education Project is staffed by a project director, an early childhood specialist, two family resource consultants, an educational psychologist (consultant), and a secretary. In addition, six prekindergarten teachers and six instructional aides are central to the project. (In 1988-89, there were only five teachers and five aides.) The teachers and aides are salaried through district funds. With the exception of the educational psychologist, all staff are Mexican-American and native Spanish speakers.

The current project director served as the early childhood specialist during the first year of the project but assumed the role of director when the initial director became head of the Title VII K-2 Transitional Program. In addition to coordinating the project, the director works closely with teachers in developing the prekindergarten curriculum and with parents in developing the three-year-olds' curriculum.

The early childhood specialist was previously a prekindergarten teacher at Kelly Elementary School, but assumed this new role during the second year of the project. She has primary responsibility for the revision of the four-year-old curriculum and works with the parents on the three-year-old curriculum, making certain that the activities provided are developmentally appropriate. This year she is also conducting parent training, along with a consultant, using the Bowdoin Parenting Materials.

The two family resource consultants live in the community and work closely with parents of three and four-year-olds in training them to participate in the education of their children. In the first year of the project they were responsible for identifying three-year-olds in the community and recruiting their parents for the project. They coordinate school-home activities and make home visits when requested by the teachers. They have recently been trained to observe how the parents of three-year-olds are implementing the new curriculum in their homes. The family resource consultants also work with the classroom teachers making certain that all the materials are available for implementing the curriculum. They are responsible for keeping project records updated (e.g., attendance at meetings) and for clerical work involving the computer. Family resource consultants must have a high school diploma or a GED and have worked for at least three years as a teacher's aide.

The educational psychologist is involved on a part-time basis and is primarily responsible for child assessment. He develops the local assessment instruments and scores and analyzes the test results.

The teachers in the project have been instrumental in developing the four-year-old curriculum. They have developed the units along with other staff members and have provided feedback once the units have been field-tested. The teachers' years of experience in early childhood education range from 0 to 12 years. They are primarily certified in bilingual and elementary education. Two have kindergarten endorsements (12 credit hours and a qualifying exam), and one is working toward her early childhood endorsement.

Training

Staff development is an integral part of the project and is supported by both project and district funds. In August 1989, a series of preservice workshops was provided by the project which discussed project philosophy and objectives, curriculum development materials, early childhood development, classroom management techniques, whole language approach in bilingual education, and teacher assistants' roles and responsibilities. During the school year 1989-90, additional workshops were held on materials development, whole language approach, and curriculum revision. In June 1990, two weeks of teacher meetings were held regarding the revision of the four-year-old curriculum. For these meetings, teachers received a $10 per hour stipend. The Project Director also held regular staff meetings during the course of the year. Teacher turnout was high, with five and six teachers attending each workshop. Paraprofessional attendance was more limited with zero to five paraprofessionals attending. In Fall 1990, four paraprofessionals took classes at Texas Southmost College that were partially financed by the project. They are working toward a degree in education.

Linkages

Parental Linkages

There is an extremely strong and active parent component in this project. Parents are responsible for developing the three-year-old curriculum, serving as home educators, participating in the Bowdoin Training workshops, serving on parent advisory groups, preparing special foods for holiday celebrations, volunteering in tutoring centers, and participating in the annual parental involvement conference and health fair. Once parents become involved in the school, they continue to remain active, particularly if their children are in any of the other Title VII programs. They appear more confident, volunteer more frequently in the classrooms, libraries, and tutorial centers,and make a more conscientious effort to attend parent teacher organization meetings. Parents are also learning English words from their children. One mother came into class and asked the teacher if the words "eye", "mouth" and "nose" were correct because she had learned them from her child. Parents request homework more for themselves in order to keep up with their children's progress. One teacher commented that a telephone conversation with a parent was conducted entirely in English before she realized it.

Curriculum development. Nine curriculum development workshops were held for parents of three-year-olds in September 1989 to discuss the home-based curriculum. Between 38 and 45 parents attended these workshops. Ten parents volunteered to develop the actual three-year-old curriculum; seven completed the project. The criteria for participation was training in the Bowdoin methods, a child in the program, and agreement to volunteer in the schools. Work on the curriculum began in October 1989, with parents developing stories and activities for their children. Six themes were developed: the body, the family, clothing, food, domestic animals, and the community. Initially, the project director and then the early childhood coordinator worked with the parents making certain the activities were developmentally appropriate and that the spelling and grammar were correct. Sixty curriculum writing sessions were held between October and June 1989. Parents involved in the curriculum development received a stipend of five dollars per hour.

Bowdoin Method training sessions. The project provides workshops for parents of three and four-year-olds in effective parenting using the Bowdoin Training Method. Ten two-hour sessions were offered in Spring 1989, with between 34 and 41 parents attending. The sessions consist of affective and cognitive parenting skills and include the following:

Attitudes

My Mommy Likes Me
Instead of Nagging
Words That Win Children
Importance of Good Feelings
How Your Child Learns

Skills

Parents are Teachers
Thousands and Thousands of Words
How Things Look
    Getting Ready for Reading
Help Your Child Read Better

Parents keep the training booklets after the training sessions are completed. As an incentive for attendance, parents receive a five dollar per hour stipend for babysitting expenses or gasoline. (In 1990-91 they received four dollars per hour because of more limited grant funds.) The Family Resource Consultant also drives parents to the session if they do not have their own transportation. Parents receive a certificate of completion. Two sessions are offered each year.

At the time of the site visit, there was a holiday celebration (complete with Santa Claus) for parents and children in the three-year-old program. The children presented a short program which was followed by awarding certificates to the parents who had completed the 10 Bowdoin training sessions. The children received Christmas gifts of crayons, scissors, and paper from the project director. Parents prepared the food (tamales, salads, desserts) for the luncheon.

Home educators. Five parents are currently being trained by the local Education Service Center to work with parents in the home implementing the three-year-old curriculum. The training lasts for four days. After the Home Educators go into the community, they will meet once every six weeks to assess the progress that parents are making.

Parental involvement conference. Two hundred parents attended the Seventh Annual Parental Involvement Conference held in April 1990. The conference, which was held over a five-day period included such topics as Teaching With Humor and Love, Personal and Family Education, the AIDS Virus, and Satanic Awareness. The district sends out a survey to parents asking them to check topics they would like presented or for suggestions for other topics. Community businesses offered 15 door prizes per day.

Health fair. In June 1990 the district held a health fair in which 40 parents participated. Topics presented over the four-day period included Nutrition, Cancer, Buckle Up for Safety, Mental Health, Dental Care, and CPR Training. The hospitals in MacAllen donated items from their own health fairs.

Educational Linkages

This preschool project is an integral part of the Hidalgo ISD and Hidalgo Elementary and Kelly Elementary Schools. District funds support the prekindergarten teachers and instructional aides. The project is well coordinated with the K-2 Transitional Program in the district which is directed by the former project director of this project. The project director reports directly to the superintendent, and coordinates with the district's curriculum department, other Federal, state, and local programs, and the principals of the two schools in which the curriculum is being implemented.

Project participants have access to all of the services, equipment and facilities at each of the schools. Administrators at each school appear to be supportive of the project. There is communication between kindergarten teachers and project staff on an as-needed basis.

Fiscal Operations

In 1989-90 the Hidalgo Early Childhood Bilingual Education Program received a grant of $188,557. More than half the funds ($108,239) were allocated for project staff including the Project Director, Early Childhood Specialists, two Family Resource Consultants, School Psychologist, and a full-time Secretary. Grant funds in 1989-90 were allocated as follows:

ITEM	AMOUNT
Personnel	$ 108,239.04
Fringe Benefits	13,936.16
Occupancy	1,352.92
Field Trip Lunches	382.48
Classroom Supplies	15,646.80
Child Testing	1,024.50
Office Supplies	3,208.17
Parent Activities (Training stipends, conf.)	22,521.88
Staff Transportation (Travel for training)	6,284.03
Child/Parent Transportation (parent meetings)	2,070.28
Parent Supplies (Binders for curriculum)	6,360.23
Teacher Stipends for Meetings	7,100.99
Total Non-Personnel Costs	79,888.44
TOTAL COSTS	**$ 188,127.48**

The balance of the grant funds, $429.52 was sent back to the federal government.

In addition to the federal grant, the district provides the salaries for the prekindergarten teachers and their instructional aides. The district also supports teacher training and provides the other non-instructional services that all children in the district receive.

Future Project Capacity

By the end of the 1990-91 project year, the district will have a field-tested and revised four-year-old curriculum. This curriculum will continue to be implemented in the prekindergarten classes after federal funds are no longer available. The three-year-old curriculum is currently being field tested. The district hopes to implement that revised curriculum in subsequent years. In addition, the district supported parent training in the Bowdoin methods in the past and will continue to do so in the future.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Several factors have been identified as contributing to this project's success. They include district support, parent involvement, and project staff. The district superintendent has been very supportive of the project since its inception. This has created a receptive environment for implementing the project and gaining the support of district staff.

Parent involvement has been very strong, both in the training and in the curriculum development components. Parents are now promoting the program to others in the district. As one family resource consultant noted, a parent commented: "Can I have a project pamphlet for my sister, she really needs to see it".

The project staff complement one another. The project director is a curriculum specialist whose expertise complements that of the early childhood specialist. The educational psychologist who analyzes the test results knows which children are having problems with particular concepts. This feedback to the teachers allows the teachers to work individually with those children. The project staff have also made the parents feel good about themselves and encouraged their involvement.

Major Challenges

Project staff indicated that getting parents involved was the most difficult challenge they encountered. They needed to educate the parents to the belief that parents play an important role in their child's education. Parents initially believed that "the teaching belongs in the school".

The Principal at one of the schools was reluctant to have teachers participate in the extensive training for developing and implementing the four-year-old curriculum. He feared that between district training and University classes, teachers would feel burned out. This principal was also biased toward English-only prekindergarten classes rather than bilingual education classes. He organized the English-only class for prekindergartners at his school. This has isolated that prekindergarten teacher, who is now unable to garner support from the project.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several recommendations were offered for bilingual preschool curriculum development projects that may be just beginning. They include the following:

- Choose a curriculum that you believe in and that is developmentally appropriate for the children in the district;
- Provide sufficient training for teachers in child development and implementation of the curriculum;
- Make certain that the classroom is child-centered;
- Provide sufficient time to plan and develop the curriculum;

- Use computers to store project data from the beginning;
- Develop parental support; and
- Organize a qualified staff who will also engage in community outreach.
- Provide an educational psychologist/consultant to evaluate the project.

Intercultural Development Research Association
Support Services for Bilingual Preschool Programs in Selected San Antonio Area School Districts
San Antonio, Texas

The Special Populations Preschool Project: Support Services for Bilingual Preschool Programs In Selected San Antonio Area School Districts is operated by the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA), a non-profit training and research organization with expertise in developing approaches for the education of language minority students. IDRA provides support services to state- and local-funded preschool programs in four San Antonio area school districts -- Harlandale Independent School District (ISD), Somerset ISD, Seguin ISD and South San Antonio ISD. These school districts, which operate half-day prekindergarten programs, are low wealth districts serving high concentrations of predominantly Mexican-American LEP students. As low wealth districts, they have not always been able to attract certified and qualified bilingual preschool teachers. Harlandale, an urban school district, and Seguin, a rural school district, were the two sites visited. The schools visited in each district were early elementary school campuses with prekindergarten and kindergarten classes. Approximately 661 LEP prekindergarten children are enrolled in the school districts served by the project; 363 prekindergarten and 298 kindergarten children. Approximately 82 percent of the children served were limited English proficient.

Program Philosophy

The project philosophy in developing this support services project is to involve teachers, administrators, and parents in creating a learning environment that is developmentally appropriate for preschool LEP children. They believe that change from a structured learning environment to a developmentally appropriate one can be accomplished only if key persons buy into the need for such change.

Project Goals

The overall goal of the project is to increase the cognitive, social, motor, and language skills of LEP four-year-olds enrolled in preschool programs in each of the participating districts. The four major objectives set to meet this overall goal include:

- To develop a cadre of master teachers available to provide appropriate instruction to preschool LEP children;
- To increase the quality of materials available to preschool LEP children;
- To increase the quality and effectiveness of the design and management of programs for preschool LEP children; and
- To increase the quality and quantity of interaction between parents and their preschool LEP children.

Project Components

To accomplish these goals, IDRA provides technical assistance support services through f component areas that impact the preschool instruction mandated by the state. The four components are training, materials, technical assistance, and parental involvement.

Training

Several of the teachers in the prekindergarten program have alternative certification in early childhood education. They have taken 12 credit hours and passed a licensing exam, but their experience has been primarily in bilingual education or elementary education. IDRA's training program was developed to bridge the gap between the teacher's knowledge of bilingual education and their limited experience with early childhood education. Twenty-four kindergarten and prekindergarten teachers were targeted in the initial proposal, 23 received training in 1989-90.

There are three training strategies employed by the project: (1) on-site assistance for the purpose of fine tuning teachers instructional skills, (2) cluster training sessions that focus on language acquisition theory and concept development, and (3) field visits to model programs.

On-site assistance. The project director and two educational specialists provide on-site assistance. In 1989-90 IDRA visited each teacher approximately five times during the course of the school year. The length of the observation varies depending on the activities the teacher is engaged in at the time of the visit. The observations focus on all aspects of instruction with particular emphasis on the teachers' level of implementation of the bilingual program components; use of materials that are culturally, linguistically, and developmentally appropriate; establishment of learning centers; classroom management; transitions from one activity to another; language usage; activities to develop children's oral language abilities and higher order thinking skills; and teacher's use of age-appropriate materials and tasks.

Feedback is provided to teachers during a post-observation debriefing. The strengths and weaknesses of classroom activities and organization are discussed in a manner supportive of the teacher. Teachers are asked if they would like any assistance in trying other instructional methods. The project staff are very sensitive to the needs of the teachers and are cognizant of the fact that change occurs slowly. Therefore, the development or refinement of skills is gradually accomplished. The principal at Seguin indicated that teachers looked forward to feedback from the classroom observations because they wanted to know "how can I do better?"

Cluster training. The project director, educational specialists, and guest speakers provide the cluster training. The project's materials specialist helps prepare materials necessary for the workshops. Most cluster training takes place at the IDRA office on Saturdays. (One workshop was held in the evening after school.) This provides a more central location for all of the school districts and also facilitates the use of the IDRA library. Saturday sessions last approximately six hours, and bilingual early childhood teachers receive a $10 per hour stipend. Teachers are sometimes given release time to attend a workshop, but this practice is generally limited as release time is usually reserved for district training. When a teacher is given release time for IDRA training, the project pays a substitute to cover the classroom. Project staff attempt to make release time activities particularly exciting to entice teachers into attending the Saturday sessions.

IDRA staff noted, however, that attendance is better during release time than on Saturdays. On weekends, it is often difficult for teachers to find child care.

Workshop topics vary each year. It is difficult to build on the topics of the previous year as there are often new teachers attending the sessions. Workshop topics are based on the results of a needs assessment administered to teachers, classroom observations by IDRA staff, and recommendations of the districts' Title VII coordinators. Workshops also incorporate how to adapt materials and work with the LEP students.

Cluster training sessions during the 1989-90 project year included the following:

Big Books -- Make-N-Take
Thematic Learning Centers
Discovery Approach to Science
How to Implement Learning Centers

With the exception of the last workshop, sessions lasted six hours. Attendance ranged from 10 to 23 teachers.

In addition to the cluster training, the project director is providing training workshops this year on implementing the Graves writing process for preschoolers. Initial planning for the Graves Writing Process began in 1989-90. Six teachers volunteered to commit themselves for the full nine sessions. The Graves writing process is used to develop children's language and expression. The workshops focus on developing a print rich environment, making books, learning techniques of talking to children about their work (in whichever language the child chooses), and analyzing the children's writing samples. Teachers bring in and discuss the actual writing samples of their students. Teachers attending the workshops are expected to share the training and materials with other teachers in their district.

Teachers are also encouraged to attend professional conferences and, as an incentive, are provided with a stipend. They must show evidence of participation in the conference by indicating the sessions they attended, what they learned at the conference, and how they are using what they learned in the classroom. In 1989-90 seven teachers attended the Texas Association for Bilingual Education Conference, f teachers attended the San Antonio Association Education for Young Children conference, and six teachers attended the San Antonio Area Association for Bilingual Education conference.

Districts with Title VII funds also provide a series of in-service workshops for teachers and aides. For example, in addition to the cluster training, Seguin provided 11 workshops for teachers and aides.

Field visits. In 1989-90 teachers visited a model early childhood campus and a private early childhood center where they could observe developmentally appropriate activities and learning centers in operation. Teachers were able to see how experienced teachers interact with four-year-olds, how learning centers are organized and used both in the classroom and outdoors, and how teachers team up to develop long-term lesson plans. Thirteen teachers visited the program. The project provided payment to the districts for substitute teachers.

Impact of the training activities. The classroom observations, coupled with the cluster training and the site visits, appear to have a visible impact on the teachers. This was evident at the two sites visited. The use of learning centers and the belief that children learn through "play" and self-directed activities is beginning to be internalized by some teachers who were not comfortable using learning centers prior to the project. The Principal of the elementary campus visited in Seguin indicated that the project provided a "good thrust in converting the early childhood program from a structured one to a developmentally appropriate one".

Teachers are also beginning to recognize the difference between creative art and pattern art as a result of a workshop on how schools foster or inhibit creativity in art. The project staff noted that some teachers are now beginning to focus on creative art.

The teachers in the Sequin ISD were so excited by their visit to the model program that the Principal sent the rest of the teachers in her school for a visit. As a result, the school modeled their outdoor education program on what they had observed. They combined the concept of outdoor play with the concept of indoor learning centers to create an outdoor learning environment. The entire prekindergarten campus now spends 45 minutes together outdoors in different learning centers (e.g., carpentry, water, theater art, painting, clay, sand) each supervised by a different teacher. One teacher rotates among the centers for general supervision. Children are free to move from center to center. Only if a teacher sees the need to develop a specific skill are children encouraged to remain at a particular center. Individual teachers are responsible for developing the lesson plans for their particular centers. This has fostered a team approach to lesson planning.

Similarly, in the Harlandale ISD, teachers have adopted a team approach to long term lesson planning. Each teacher is responsible for developing a unit that he/she shares with other teachers in the school.

Finally, administrators in both school districts commented that they were grateful that the Title VII project at IDRA keeps them in touch with current issues and trends in early childhood education. They feel the project is an important resource for their teachers.

Materials

The objective of the materials component is to familiarize teachers with existing bilingual and multicultural materials. Staff in the participating school districts have access to IDRA's bilingual, multicultural resource lending library which has 7,000 acquisitions in the following areas: posters and pictures; children's literature (Spanish, English, and both languages) including books, cassettes, records, filmstrips and multi-media kits; records and cassettes; theory books on child growth and development, language, and culture; subject and idea books for teaching math, science, art, motor skills, and language to four-year-olds; CDA training materials for setting up learning centers; parent training materials; and professional journals.

The materials from the library are used for conducting teacher workshops. In addition, IDRA provides a workshop to teachers from each district on the use of the library and available materials. IDRA facilitates the use of its library materials by providing varying approaches to checking out materials. Teachers can check out materials in person when they attend workshops. Alternatively, teachers are called by the materials specialist prior to site visits to see what units they will be covering in the coming weeks. Appropriate materials are then selected for them. The delivery of materials is critical, as two of the school districts--Seguin and Somerset--are relatively far from the IDRA library. Without the delivery service, teachers might not be able to avail themselves of all the resources.

For some school districts such as Harlandale, where there is an existing Title VII Bilingual Early Childhood Education project and a bilingual resource teacher, the IDRA materials serve as supplements to existing materials. Other school districts may not have as rich instructional resources. Approximately 1,000 instructional materials were checked out over the course of the 1989-90 project year.

The preschool administrators in the four participating school districts were provided with an annotated bibliography of bilingual, early childhood, multicultural materials available through the resource library.

In addition to the library materials, the project director has compiled all of the materials provided at the various educational conferences into a handbook for all teachers. It is thematically organized (e.g., learning centers, creative art) and spiral bound and serves as a resource for teachers.

The classrooms have various examples of IDRA developed materials. Of particular note were a series of signs for each developmental learning area. These signs are clearly written (in English) explaining the objectives/goals of each learning area. For parents, visitors, professionals, volunteers, evaluators, and others not trained in early childhood education who want to know why children only "play" rather than "learn", these provide an opportunity to learn about the function of different areas of the classroom. The signs also reinforce what parents are learning in the parental education component of the project.

Technical Assistance

The technical assistance component involves two management seminars each year for preschool administrators from each of the participating school districts. In general, mid-level administrators such as the Title VII coordinators and supervisors of the Federal contracts program, with the exception of Chapter I personnel, attend the workshop. With school-based management becoming the norm in these districts, the principals have assumed more responsibility for the daily operation of their schools and are often unavailable.

An informal needs assessment was conducted to determine the areas of interest and/or needs that the project should address during the seminars. The first session focused on high expectations for teachers and students. Eight administrators attended this three hour session: the bilingual director and two Title VII coordinators from Harlandale; the federal programs director and Title VII coordinator from Seguin; the bilingual coordinator from South San Antonio (none of the six school principals were able to attend); and the principal and one other administrator from Somerset. Six administrators--four from Harlandale and two from Somerset--attended the second session presented by the Texas Education Agency on agency guidelines for the bilingual preschool program and essential elements for the three-year-old program.

In the spring of 1991, IDRA is planning a full day retreat on a Friday for administrators. The session will be designed to help administrators focus on how they will implement early childhood education for three-year-olds and whether it should it be mandated by the state. (The state legislature is currently considering school-based education for LEP three-year-olds). As an incentive to encourage attendance, school administrators, when possible, receive credit for ongoing training.

Parental Involvement

The parental involvement component is designed to help parents recognize the role they play in developing their children's experiences, language, concepts, and self-concept. Parent workshops provide parents with activities that they can do at home which promote the cognitive, social/emotional, language, and motor development of their children. Workshops are provided in English and Spanish, depending on the parents' facility with English.

Parent recruitment. The project director relies on administrators in each district to solicit the support of parents for training. Workshops are announced through bilingual flyers that are distributed through the classroom teachers. In Harlandale, workshop invitations are sent out one week before the workshop, with a reminder sent home the day before. Posters are also placed around the campus. During teacher training workshops IDRA reinforces the importance of parents as partners in school and encourages teachers to solicit parental support actively. The project proposal targeted 48 parents for training each year, 12 from each district. The same parents do not always attend each workshop in the district. Parental participation varies with the school district and, in 1989-90, ranged from three to 18 participants per district. In districts such as Seguin and Harlandale, where the Title VII coordinators have already established a strong parent component, turnout is strong. Workshops in these districts are held during the day, and parent volunteers or senior citizens provide child care for younger siblings. Before the workshops begin, refreshments are served to parents and siblings.

In Somerset, workshops are held only in the evening to accommodate working parents. As an incentive for parent participation, dramatic or musical presentations are offered by one of the project classes. The parents of children in that class attend the production and then stay for the workshop that follows. At the next workshop, another class presents a production. The limitation with using different classroom presentations is that there is always a greater proportion of parents whose children are in the classroom presentations. There is not a consistent turnout. Child care is provided at the site for parents who attend the workshops.

In South San Antonio, the early childhood program is divided among six campuses. Teachers host the workshops at their respective campuses. This assures greater participation by parents when held at the respective campuses. Workshops are held both after school and in the evening.

Workshop topics. Selection of workshop topics is based on the input of parents and administrators. A needs assessment survey in Spanish and English was sent home to the parents of all the preschool children participating in the program. Unfortunately, the response rate was low either because notices were sent home with children and may not have reached home, parents are not able to read in either English or Spanish, and/or teachers' follow-up to make certain the surveys were returned was not consistent. In addition to the survey, the project director consulted with the principals in the Somerset ISD and the Title VII coordinators at Harlandale and Seguin to determine parent needs.

Workshop topics in 1989-90 included:

- Characteristics of four- and five-year-olds;
- Home teaching activities for parents to do with their young children;
- Communicating with your child;
- Learning adventures in the early childhood classroom;
- How children learn;
- Making arts and crafts;
- Understanding bilingual education;
- Building children's self-esteem; and
- Ages and stages of child development.

Parent impact. It is difficult to assess the impact on the parents of the three training sessions IDRA provided per district. School districts provide a variety of workshops during the year. The project workshops are coordinated with these to address the needs of the parents.

The Title VII coordinator at Harlandale did note that as a result of parent training, both through IDRA and the school district, parents feel more comfortable in the school and are volunteering in classrooms, the Title VII office, and the library, and are actively involved in preparing materials to complement the curriculum. The Title VII coordinator in Harlandale also commented that the IDRA project director provided a positive role model for the parents.

Staff

Qualifications

The IDRA staff consists of one full-time project director, two full-time education assistants, a full-time materials specialist and a part-time secretary. With the exception of the project director, who is Caucasian, all the staff are Hispanic. All staff members are bilingual. The project director is certified in early childhood education, bilingual education, and special education and has 10 years experience in early childhood education. She also has an M.A. in Supervision of Curriculum and Instruction.

Central to this project are the 10 teachers and paraprofessionals in the districts who are supported through tax levy funds. Most of these teachers are certified in elementary and bilingual education but not in early childhood education. At least four of the teachers do not have a kindergarten endorsement or formal training in early childhood education.

Educational Linkages

The school districts and school administrators are generally supportive of the project. This was evidenced at the two sites visited. The principal in Seguin is a strong proponent of early childhood education and welcomed the opportunity to have teachers and parents trained through the project. Seguin has a Title VII coordinator who works closely with project staff. The school superintendent and the bilingual supervisor are also very supportive. The superintendent was pleased to have a training project in the district. As the superintendent noted "it provided a training resource that would otherwise have come out of the district's limited resources".

Harlandale also has a Title VII coordinator and resource person who work very closely with project staff. They have been instrumental in recruiting parents to workshops and involving them in the education of their children. IDRA parent workshops are coordinated with those provided by the district. The bilingual director indicated that IDRA's technical assistance is welcomed as the district can stretch its limited resources to address other needs for the preschool classroom. He also indicated that the district assistant superintendent is very supportive of bilingual/transitional programs.

Fiscal Operations

In 1989-90 IDRA received a Special Population Preschool Grant of $224,771. More than half the funds supported personnel. Approximately 30 percent of the project director's time was spent on program administration.

Future Project Capacity

IDRA's commitment to the school districts will end when the funding for the project ends. The Title VII programs in each of the school districts will be responsible for continued staff development and parent training.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

IDRA's ability to provide quality training for teachers is the key element in making this a successful project. IDRA staff are very knowledgeable about early childhood education and able to share this knowledge in a supportive, non-threatening manner with the teachers. The classroom visits enable IDRA staff to identify the critical need areas and provide follow-up assistance on an individual basis. The classroom observations also help staff to assess how learning theory is put into actual practice.

The visits to a model early childhood campus and a private early childhood center enable teachers to see developmentally appropriate activities and learning centers in operation. These visits help teachers learn new ideas that they can subsequently implement in their schools and classrooms.

IDRA training also provides credibility to the Title VII programs in each of the districts. As outside experts, IDRA staff validate what the district staff are trying to implement. IDRA keeps teachers informed about current trends in early childhood education and how to provide a developmentally appropriate learning environment.

Major Challenges

Communication between project staff and teachers is the major challenge in this project. IDRA staff need to be visible and persistent because they are not housed within the school district. This necessitates numerous telephone calls and much correspondence to make certain information is relayed. In South San Antonio, for example, the superintendent implemented a policy whereby all project memos to the teachers must be routed through the superintendent's office. It is then routed back to the teachers through the bilingual coordinator. Since the bilingual coordinator is responsible for bilingual programs in prekindergarten through grade 12 and administers six campuses, information does not always get communicated in a timely fashion.

Another challenge is maintaining a developmentally appropriate learning environment for preschool children when state regulations require a certain level of academic achievement for first graders. Children are now tested in first grade, which creates pressures for the kindergarten and prekindergarten teachers to teach a more "academic" curriculum. It is difficult for teachers to respond while still providing a developmentally appropriate program.

Two other challenges were initially faced in some of the districts. In one school district, the early childhood coordinator was not involved in the development of the proposal. This resulted in some tension between the bilingual director and the early childhood coordinator. They did not feel an equal sense of ownership and commitment to the project. The project director has worked to alleviate the tensions in the district.

In another school district, there was some jealousy by some non-project teachers who were not the recipients of the services provided by the project. To alleviate that situation, all the teachers now get together during their break to share ideas, and project teachers make copies of IDRA hand-outs. All the teachers have become part of a prekindergarten team.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several recommendations were made for future bilingual early childhood programs. They include the following:

- Make certain the person in charge of the early childhood programs has the appropriate training and background in early childhood and bilingual education;
- Define goals clearly and recognize the fact that all needs cannot be addressed;
- Provide the opportunity for teachers to have input into the project; and
- Gain the support of school and district administrators.

English Language Development Program for Inupiat Three-year olds
Ililgaat Tupqat (Children's House)
Kotzebue, Alaska

The Title VII Special Populations Program was a preschool project for three-year-old Inupiat Eskimos in Kotzebue, a fishing village north of the Arctic Circle in Northwest Alaska. The program was housed in a licensed, private day care center that was established in 1975. All participants enrolled in the program were limited English proficient--speaking a dialect of English influenced by an Alaska native language called Inupiaq.[1] All participants also lived with families whose incomes were below the federal poverty line.

The Special Populations project was initiated in response to observations that incoming four-year-olds at Kotzebue Elementary School demonstrated a lack of English language proficiency and because of a lack of funds for early intervention of three- and four-year-olds. Kotzebue Day Care Center stepped in to provide a program to enable at-risk three-year olds in the school district to achieve English language proficiency and, in consequence, to adjust to and function better in prekindergarten at the elementary school.

Integral to the program was a concern for the maintenance of Inupiat cultural and community traditions that local elders felt were eroding, as evidenced by the region's high rate of alcoholism, family violence, and deteriorating family values.

Program Philosophy

Children's House is a state-certified preschool founded on developmentally appropriate practice as advocated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children. The Title VII project was initiated so that staff could integrate disadvantaged three-year olds into the already established preschool program. The overall program philosophy, as supported by elders in the community, was to rededicate children to traditional Inupiat values. This emphasis was reinforced by a U.S. Department of Education study that concluded that "traditional values are twice as important to school success" as a student's socio-economic background.[2] The program also emphasized improvement of English language skills, which, according to the project proposal, "provide the basic building blocks for their educational structure and later success."

Project Goals

General goals. The primary goal stated in the project proposal was to: "help the Inupiat children of the Northwest Arctic Region of Alaska gain a sound background of traditional values and to improve their ability to understand and speak the English language by developing and implementing a program for three-year olds emphasizing the Inupiat Ilitqusiat (cultural values) taught through English language development activities."

---

[1] Note that the people are collectively called Inupiat and their language Inupiaq.

[2] Ginsburg, A. and Hanson, S. Gaining Ground: Values and High School Success. Washington, D.C., 1980.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Curriculum. The curriculum goal was to help children develop a strong English language base while learning about things related to their own environment and Inupiat culture. During the first year of the project, staff were to develop and pilot test eight months of a 12-month curriculum and related materials, and complete the final four months of the curriculum during the second program year.

Staff. Goals for staff included training three child-care staff members to use the curriculum and materials and, by the third year, to be certificated with a Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential in Early Childhood.

The project decided to postpone its goal for CDA training because college courses were not available at nearby institutions. Project staff also fell behind schedule in curriculum development because they found it too cumbersome to complete the curriculum in two years while trying to run the program. A draft of the curriculum was not available until summer 1990.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

The project utilized a variety of methods to recruit children. These methods included:

- Holding open houses for parents of small children;
- Posting flyers and posters alerting parents of three-year olds from the surrounding village;
- Word of mouth through former students and their families;
- Announcements at PTA meetings; and
- Advertisements on the radio and in the biweekly newspaper.

Potential participants were screened through the Brigance Preschool Screen for Three and Four-year-olds. For the first program year, all 25 children screened were accepted into the program; 32 were screened in the second year; and 38 were screened in the third year. An Indian Child Welfare worker and social services staff assisted in identifying disadvantaged children for the program, and the project director made the final decision about which 25 were accepted. Acceptance into the program was based on low scores on the developmental sections on the Brigance and low-income status of children's families. Half of the children chosen had special education needs. Those children who were not chosen for the program were placed on a waiting list (unless they moved away), but for the most part they enrolled in public school.

Enrollment

The Kotzebue project set as a target the enrollment of 25 limited English proficient three-year-olds each year. This number varied somewhat during the school year because some children moved to or from nearby villages. Twenty-five children enrolled during 1987-88; 26 enrolled in 1988-89; and 27 enrolled in 1989-90.

Retention

Retention of children was not considered to be a problem. During the first year of the project, only two children left without completing the program, and none left in the second and third years. The primary reason for leaving the program was because a child's family moved to another village.

Despite high retention, monthly attendance varied from 58 percent to 74 percent, due to factors such as inclement weather, illness, and parents' occupations.

Schedules

Children attended classes three hours a day, four days a week, 50 weeks per year. Fridays were reserved for evaluation of the week's activities, staff training, and preparation for the coming week. For most of the year, children attended classes during the morning. During the summer months, however (when it is light virtually 24 hours each day), classes began at 1:30 p.m. because children usually stayed up late. The half-day format was chosen to allow integration of disadvantaged three-year olds into the regular day care program without disruption.

Instructional Strategies

Instruction was based on activities and experiences that elicited oral language and on the belief that children learn best by manipulating concrete objects, using their senses, and interacting with adults and other children. Although all Title VII participants were LEP, the teacher spoke only English to children, in part because the project could not find any fluent Inupiaq speakers.

Curriculum. A curriculum developer/trainer was hired to develop a curriculum with input from Inupiat elders as to the types of traditional values to be taught and development of games and toys. Development of the curriculum was coordinated with the school district's early childhood curriculum for four-year-olds. The curriculum, called Uqaqta -- Let's Talk, was organized around themes and seasonal cultural activities based on Inupiat values and culture. Each lesson in the curriculum included a designated theme and Inupiat value, objective, materials to use, recommended group size, key words and phrases, and enumerated activities. Examples of weekly and monthly themes were "Things We Do in Winter," "Families/Homes," "Dog Sledding," "Inupiat Crafts," "Safety," and "Whale Hunting." Values that were integrated into these lessons were: knowledge of language, sharing, respect for others, cooperation, respect for elders, love for children, hard work, knowledge of family tree, avoidance of conflict, respect for nature, spirituality, humor, family roles, hunter success, domestic skills, humility, and responsibility to tribe.

Instructional organization and grouping. The amount of time spent in different grouping patterns varied and overlapped from day to day and week to week, but lessons were structured for three different grouping sizes: circle time (whole group), small group, and free choice:

> Circle time is designed for discussing the weekly theme, weather, and upcoming events, singing songs, and doing finger plays.

Small group activities are designed for groups of up to 10 children, with lessons lasting 15 to 20 minutes in a guided learning experience. These activities are usually scheduled during free choice periods or during outdoor activity times.

Free choice is a designated time when children may choose where they want to work, usually working independently with minimal adult assistance. Free choice time allows the instructor or aide to move freely through the classroom and guide children through a small group activity.

Small group instruction was used most frequently, while whole group instruction, story hours, and individualized instruction were used less frequently, although staff emphasized giving participants time to have one-to-one interaction with their teacher. Children also took short field trips once or twice a month.

A typical daily schedule in the final year follows:

7:30a.m. - Arrival
8:30a.m. - Breakfast
9:00a.m. - Circle Time
9:30a.m. - Free Choice
10:30a.m. - Story Time
11:00a.m. - Outside Activities
11:30a.m. - Lunch
12:00p.m - Nap and Rest Time
2:00p.m. - Wake Up and Get Dressed
2:30p.m. - Snack Time
3:00p.m. - Outside Activities
3:30p.m. - Free Choice
4:40p.m. - Clean Up and Go Home

Children were grouped by age and developmental level--three-year olds at the lower developmental stages, called "Polar Bears"; and more advanced three-year olds and four-year-olds, called "Grizzly Bears." The preschool served a variety of ages--mostly three- and four-year-olds--but three-year olds funded under Title VII were grouped with other three-year olds not in the program.

Learning centers. Learning centers were placed according to activity and age group, with Polar Bears and Grizzly Bears having separate activity areas. The preschool classroom set up about 15 learning centers for Polar Bears, including the following: two crafts/meals centers, computer, listening, reading, painting, table toys, three floor-toy centers, sand table, table toys/meals, gross motor/climber, playhouse, and housekeeping. Grizzly Bears used 20 separate learning centers, including centers similar to those of the Polar Bears. In addition, they had a fish tank, science center, piano, floor puzzles, large motor climber, living room/dress-up, writing with stencils, and water play.

Materials and Equipment

Materials used in the classroom were chosen to reflect the local climate, animals, transportation, and culture. Many elders in the community were asked to help build toys and games for the children. Some of the materials included dolls with winter clothing like parkas and snow boots; toys such as dog sleds, snow machines, and ski planes; a wood stove; models of Arctic animals such as whales, seals, and beavers; and puzzles. Toys were rotated weekly.

Non-Instructional Services

The Kotzebue Center provided two primary services to the Inupiat children: a van that transported children to and from the Day Care Center; and breakfast that was served each morning. Breakfast was funded by the state's Department of Education Food Service Program, and the van service was funded by the Center's General Fund.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Early childhood teachers, under supervision of the curriculum developer/trainer, administered an assessment checklist of each child's "developmental progress" four times each year--September, February, March, and August. Progress was measured based on pre- and post-scores on this checklist and on the Brigance Preschool Screen. Most of the 17 participants who were tested at the beginning and end of the year showed gains of one to two points on all items of the developmental checklist. Based on a four-point scale, most entered the program at 1 (non-functional or nonverbal) or 2 (low) and ended at 3 (medium) or 4 (high). In the second year of the project, 88 percent or more of participants showed gains in each area measured by the developmental observation checklist including oral language, comprehension, cultural values, fine and gross motor skills, interaction with children and adults, self-esteem, and awareness of feelings. The 17 participants given the Brigance Preschool Screen at the beginning and end of the year also showed gains on all subscales. While children typically scored an initial 30 to 60 on the Brigance out of a possible 100, many children climbed to 90 or more by the end of the year.

Evaluation of child progress was also based on teacher observations, particularly for children with incomplete pre- and post-scores. By the end of each year, staff found that participants were less anxious, better at responding to their teacher, had longer attention spans during story times, and were better able to follow directions.

Follow-Up Evaluations

After the end of each of the three program years, all children were mainstreamed into prekindergarten classes for four-year-olds at Kotzebue Elementary School. Kotzebue staff plan to interview kindergarten teachers to see how the children are adjusting.

Project staff wanted to test children who were not selected for the preschool program so that they could compare their skills with the participants, but not enough parents brought them in to be tested.

Staff

Qualifications

Project staff consisted of the project director, a curriculum developer/trainer, a lead teacher, and two additional teachers. Each of these teachers was already working full-time for the preschool before the Title VII grant was available. Title VII paid 100 percent of the curriculum developer's time and 30 to 40 percent of the teachers' and project director's salaries during the three project years. The Federal grant allowed staff to teach more children, help develop the curriculum, obtain training, and develop lesson plans. Project staff attempted to enlist the help of volunteers but found that most parents worked, had other children at home, or were uncomfortable volunteering in the schools.

All instructional staff had some college education. Two of the teachers had two-year degrees and the curriculum developer/trainer had a bachelor's in early childhood education and certification in elementary/early childhood education. All staff except the curriculum developer/trainer were Inupiat, but none of the staff was fluent in Inupiaq.

Staff turnover was low except in the infant-toddler program, where low pay, low status, and hard work contributed to high turnover.

Training

Staff training was available for the three teachers and teacher's aide in three areas: in-house training sessions conducted each Friday by the program's curriculum developer/trainer (paid through the Title VII grant); weekly half-hour sessions with a certified special education teacher to work on children's language deficiencies; and attendance at an annual three-day conference in Anchorage (paid through a state grant). Instructional staff received a total of 90 hours of in-house training in 1987-88 and 120 hours in 1988-89 and 1989-90. Weekly training topics were determined by the teachers' needs, but training was concentrated in curriculum development and in the CDA functional areas such as maintaining discipline, designing materials, and preparing lesson plans.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

Because of the project's and the Kotzebue community's emphasis on maintaining traditional values, project staff have sought input from elders in the community; however, parents were much more reluctant to become involved in the project or volunteer in the classroom. Kotzebue held four parent workshops each year but drew only about 20 percent of parents, despite attempts to encourage more parent participation and to help parents feel more comfortable about the program. Examples of workshop topics included "How to Foster Self-Esteem in Children" and "Traditions Begin at Home--Read to Your Children." All parents attended the two parent-teacher conferences because their attendance was required. A group of parents also met every other month to review activities and provide suggestions on curriculum resources that would be culturally relevant.

Kotzebue also kept in contact with parents through regular phone calls, home visits by project staff, and a bimonthly newsletter for parents. Despite these efforts, the project director lamented that parents did not demonstrate much interest in their children's education and that many of them looked at the preschool program as a free source of babysitting for their young children.

Educational and Community Linkages

Interaction with the local elementary school was limited after preschoolers reached kindergarten. The primary linkage was through exchanging test results and attending in-service training provided by the school district.

Community involvement was important in recruiting children and promoting the project as well as the cultural values of the Inupiat people. The project relied heavily on local elders, whose function was to promote cultural survival and transmit traditional Inupiat values and skills. Twice a week, children visited elders across the street at the Kotzebue Senior Citizens Cultural Center. A committee of individuals from various community agencies in Kotzebue was formed prior to the start of the Title VII program and met twice a year to assess the needs of the community, including preschool children. The City of Kotzebue was responsible for handling the financial end of the grant; Children's House contracted with the city for pass-through funds. The city also leased a building for the preschool program.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

The total amount for the Special Populations Grant in FY 1990 was $123,117, accounting for about 98 percent of the funding for the 25 program participants. The remainder of their funding was state money used to pay for the children's breakfast. The program's General Fund provided approximately $30,000 each year for in-kind services such as equipment, the van service, and utilities. The General Fund consists of nominal parent fees, Alaska day care assistance, and a state child care grant. The total budget for the Day Care Center--including Title VII and other funding sources--was about $450,000.

Future Project Capacity

After the termination of the Title VII grant in summer 1990, the preschool classes for three-year olds ended, but the project expected to reopen with Head Start funds in January 1991. While the Head Start program will operate with the curriculum developed under the Title VII grant, it has broader eligibility than Title VII and will have increased services such as health screening and counseling.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

The project director notes two factors that contributed most to the project's success: project staff and community support. She noted the experience, enthusiasm, and hard work of the project's curriculum developer/trainer and the willingness of teachers to work on weekends and to get involved in and out of the classroom. Community support, once the project was underway, was important in publicizing the project and contributing materials for the children's toys and lessons.

Major Challenges

The project faced several hurdles, especially during its first year. These included:

- Project staff "bit off more than they could chew" by trying to develop a curriculum, train staff, and educate children all at the same time;
- Encouraging parents to participate in the program was difficult. They showed very little interest in their children's progress or in volunteering in the classroom;
- Figuring out how to obtain money from the federal grant was complicated. Money was funneled through the city of Kotzebue, which also didn't know much about federal grants; and
- The director was unable to find qualified staff that could speak the Inupiaq language.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The project director offered three suggestions for other preschool bilingual projects:

- Provide transportation for the participants as part of the grant;
- Publicize the project in the local community; and
- Try not to do too much when starting out. Project staff at Kotzebue found out very quickly that it was too much for them to tackle curriculum development, staff training, and teaching children. There was never enough time to do all three adequately.

Fillmore Unified School District
Special Populations Preschool Program
Fillmore, California

The Fillmore Unified School District Special Populations Preschool Program served a combination of limited English proficient (LEP) and English-speaking children ages three to five. The LEP children entering the program had little or no understanding of English. This rural district serves a predominantly low income migrant population in Ventura County, California.

Program Philosophy

The project framework was based on three sources: research in early childhood education; the district's concept of early childhood education, which focuses on the home, school, and local community; and on previous experience with a Migrant Preschool Program funded under a special state grant for innovative approaches to migrant education. Fillmore's Special Populations Preschool Program served both parents and children. Parents attended preschool with their children (and younger siblings, where necessary) and practiced how to be teachers at home.

Project Goals

The project goals were directed to both children and parents.

Pupils: To enhance the child's primary language development;

To develop school readiness and social skills (e.g., learning to work in groups, following routines).

Parents: To enable parents to learn how to teach their children;

To foster the participation of parents in all school activities;

To teach parents about nutrition and health.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

A variety of methods were employed to recruit participants to this project including:

- Posting flyers and posters in the school district;
- Placing advertisements in local newspapers, including columns in Spanish;
- Holding open houses for parents; and
- Sending invitations to parents who have older children who participated in the Title II or migrant programs.

While the project was open to all prekindergarten children in the district, enrollment was based on the following three criteria:

- A parent or day care provider agreed to participate in the project daily;
- The child had to be at least three years old; and
- Parents agreed to a home visit once per month by project staff to enable staff to see how parents instructed their child and to assess the progress they were making in teaching their child.

While there was little difficulty recruiting participants for this project, there was some difficulty enrolling English-only participants. These families initially chose not to participate because they were under the mistaken impression that this project was an extension of the earlier preschool migrant program targeted to Spanish-speaking families. English-speaking parents were angered that Spanish-speaking families were again the recipients of services that they also needed. Home visits were made to these families to explain the Title VII project. The hostile feelings dissipated over the course of the years and more English-speaking children began to participate.

Enrollment

The project officially enrolled 60 children in each year of operation. As enrollment figures indicate, the number of English-only children increased from 20 percent in 1987-88 to 40 percent in 1989-90.

Year	LEP	English Only	Total
1987-88	45	15	60
1988-89	40	20	60
1989-90	38	25	63

In addition to those children formally enrolled, the project also served participants' younger siblings. Project administrators recognized that care for younger children must be provided if parents were to participate in the project. In the first year, 10 additional children ages one to three were served; in the second year, 12 children were served; and, in the third year, the number rose to 20. Most of these children were Spanish-speaking. To defray the costs of the additional children, these children's parents volunteered in the classrooms and provided the snacks.

To maintain enrollment in the classes, the project provided transportation, care for younger siblings, and home visits by the teacher and/or aides on a monthly basis.

Retention

Although accurate figures were not available on the number of participants who left the project without completing, the project manager estimated that four children left in 1988-89 and eight children left in 1989-90. The primary reason for leaving was that families moved away from the community.

Schedules

The project operated a morning and afternoon session in San Cayetano Elementary School and a morning session in Piru Elementary School. Each session ran for two and one half hours. Parents and their children, however, often came one half hour prior to the start of the class each day to work and play in the classrooms. The program operated Monday through Thursday, with Friday reserved for staff development in the morning and home visits in the afternoons. Children remained in the program two to three years, depending on the age that they were first enrolled.

Instructional Strategies

Curriculum. The curriculum was designed to provide language-enriching experiences for the participants using all the major subject areas. Generally, different themes were explored on a monthly basis. Among the curriculum themes introduced were "the self", the family, the community (e.g., school, church, grocery store), seasons, animals, and transportation.

In the second year of the project, the curriculum was modified to emphasize more instruction in the areas of alphabet knowledge, rhyming, verb tenses, sentence word order, comprehension, and reading terminology in order to prepare the participants better for the Test of Basic Education-2 (TOBE-2) administered when they entered kindergarten.

Instruction. A variety of instructional strategies were employed to provide developmentally appropriate learning experiences for the children. The day began with a full-group activity referred to as the Magic Circle. During this half-hour activity, parents learned techniques for teaching their children, new curriculum themes were introduced, and previously introduced themes were reinforced through role playing, singing, and dancing. A Teacher of the Day was selected to lead the Magic Circle. Initially a parent and child were selected as Teacher of the Day but, as the year progressed only children were selected for this role. Teacher of the Day was a key element in fostering the child's self-esteem.

In addition to the Magic Circle, instruction was provided through learning centers set up for science, math, and motor skills/art activities; individual learning on an as-needed basis; story hour, and field trips. Regular physical activities, both indoor and outdoor, were provided to develop large motor skills and healthy exercise habits. The amount of time spent in any one activity varied during the course of the year.

Spanish was the language used by teachers at the beginning of each year with the Spanish-speaking children. English was used with the native English speakers. As the Spanish children's English language proficiency increased, English was introduced. By the time participants entered kindergarten, 95 percent were bilingual.

Grouping. For instruction, children were grouped by native languages (English or Spanish). Children who were bilingual were grouped with either English- or Spanish-speaking children. Groups changed as the year progressed and English language proficiency improved. By the end of March, the five-year-olds were grouped by ability and taught skills necessary for kindergarten.

Non-Instructional Services

Several non-instructional services funded by the project were provided to participants. Since there is no public transportation and many LEP families live on ranches and in agricultural camps outside the local community, free bus transportation to and from school was provided. Parents also received nutritional training through parent workshops.

In addition, through tax levy funds, the district provided families with referrals to various social service agencies concerned with housing, welfare, and counseling. Health clinics provided health and pre-natal information to parents participating in the project.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

A combination of standardized inventories, teacher-made checklists, and teacher observations were used to measure participant progress. All evaluation data were transferred with the child when the child enrolled in the district's regular kindergarten program. Pre- and post-test gains on the Pre-LAS (Preschool Language Assessment Scales) were the primary means for assessing child progress in English and Spanish language acquisition. In the first year of operation, test results indicated that children enrolled in the program improved both their primary language and their English language fluency. Children achieved a mean post-test score of 4.5 out of 5 on the Pre-LAS taken in Spanish. Of the children taking the post-test in Spanish, 92 percent achieved a score of 4 or above, and 75 percent achieved a score of 5. Of the children taking the post-test Pre-LAS in English, 100 percent achieved a score of 4 or above. No pre-test scores were available. No evaluation data for more recent years are currently available.

Upon enrollment, a child's school readiness was assessed via the Portage Checklist of developmental skills. During the school year, to document their progress, children were regularly monitored against the Portage Checklist. No data are currently available.

Teacher-made checklists and teacher observations were also used to measure participant progress in language development and physical and motor development. Teachers maintained anecdotal records on each child. On Fridays, when children were not in attendance, teachers discussed the progress of the children.

Follow-up Evaluations

Upon entering kindergarten, project participants were tested with the Test of Basic Education (TOBE-2). This is a standardized measure of student progress in language and mathematics. No evaluation data are available.

Project personnel had informal conversations with kindergarten teachers to assess child performance once they left the project. These conversations indicated that the project participants tended to be class leaders.

No information is currently available on the placement of LEP project participants once they left the project.

Staff

Characteristics and Roles

The Special Populations Preschool Program was staffed by two Hispanic, bilingual, state-certified preschool teachers, one of whom had been the Migrant Preschool Coordinator; four part-time aides; and a part-time project director. A teacher and aides were assigned to each class. One teacher taught both classes at San Cayetano and another teacher taught the class at Piru. The teachers had between 12 and 15 years of experience in early childhood education. They were responsible for planning and conducting model lessons on a daily basis, operating the program daily, supervising the aides, and assisting parents in learning how to be effective teachers at home. There was no turnover among the teachers.

Of the four part-time aides funded by the project, two were assigned to San Cayetano in the morning session, and one each was assigned to San Cayetano in the afternoon and to Piru in the morning. The aides had little previous training. Most often they were parents of project participants or were parents who were involved in the Migrant Preschool Program. The teacher aides were trained to work with the teachers in developing curriculum and developing and implementing lesson plans. The aides also helped with lunches and cleanup, as there was no custodian for this purpose. In addition to assisting in the classroom, the aides made home visits to assist parents in instructing their children and to help them obtain needed services.

The aides frequently left the preschool project to become aides in the elementary or junior high school. A total of 11 aides were associated with the project. All but one were Hispanic and bilingual in Spanish and English. There was one English-only aide who by the end of the year had learned enough Spanish to communicate with the children.

Parents worked in the classroom on a regular basis. They worked with children in small groups, prepared special programs around ethnic holidays, and provided nutritional snacks.

Training

Staff development was provided through the district, the project, and other outside institutions. The district provided approximately 50 hours of training each year for teachers and 30 for teacher aides. District training focused on developing more advanced skills in the areas of natural approach to language acquisition, stimulating language arts and literacy skills for both children and parents, and home teaching techniques. The project provided in-service training on a monthly basis. Project staff have also participated in the in-service training offered through the University of Southern California to all district staff. This training was in the area of language arts and literacy.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

Project staff believed that parents are the most important teachers of their children. They therefore encouraged their presence in the classroom and their attendance at parent workshops. If parents could not attend classes with their children, the child's caretaker came to class. Parents or caretakers took turns being the "teacher" during instructional activities. Parent instruction was monitored by project staff through home visits to observe parents interacting with their children during an individually assigned learning task. The home visits were modeled on the Migrant Preschool Program. Parents were accustomed to having school staff visit their home as a result of this earlier project. In addition to instructional activities, in the first year of project operation, parents held a fund-raising dinner and a "graduation" luncheon and turned the proceeds over to the district for their children's education.

Approximately six parent workshops were offered each year. Topics included child development, nutrition, health, school curriculum, how to have a successful teacher conference, safety, and drug and alcohol abuse and prevention. People from the community often conducted these workshops (e.g., the safety workshop was conducted by the fire department).

Parents met on a monthly basis with the project teachers. In addition, they met twice a year with the elementary school teachers so that they could learn the sequence of the curriculum and prepare their children for kindergarten. During the first year of project operation, approximately 25 percent of the parents attended one or more of the School Site Council meetings. No data were available for later years.

The project anticipated offering ESL classes for parents, but had difficulty finding an instructor willing to accept a part-time position. In part, this was because of the large demand for ESL instructors in other programs.

Educational Linkages

The Fillmore Unified School District was responsible for administering, staffing, and housing this project. District funds supported the part-time project director and partially supported the two preschool teachers. Instructional supplies and materials were also partially funded by the district. Training workshops were supported by the district. The full resources of the district, including psychological services and counseling, evaluation and program planning assistance, budget and financial planning assistance, community outreach services for migrant students, nurse and health-related services, and personnel services, were made available to project participants and staff.

Meetings were held between the project staff and the district's kindergarten teachers to improve the match between the project's preparation and the district's expectations for kindergarten students. Children's achievement and anecdotal records were transferred to the kindergarten teacher when the children entered kindergarten.

All the facilities of the school were available to project participants. The classes were fully integrated into the school environment with children participating in school assemblies, trips, and other activities. Principals were very supportive of the project and provided keys to project staff to enable them to have access to school equipment.

Fiscal Operations

The budget proposed for 1989-90 itemized the following expenditures for both grant funds and district funds:

Costs for Instructional Activities	Grant Funds	District Funds
Personnel	47,748	$35,942
Fringe Benefits	9,619	7,262
Supplies	6,332	2,000
Contractual (portable classrooms, transportation)	17,000	
Other (evaluator, field trips)	5,000	
Costs for Training	2,000	
Subtotal	87,822	45,204
Indirect Costs	5,804	
TOTAL	**93,497**	**45,204**

Future Project Capacity

The Fillmore Unified School District project ended in June 1990 when federal funding terminated. The district had intended to continue the project, but cuts in the state budget precluded this option.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Several factors contributed to this project's success. The most important factor was parental involvement. Parents attended classes with their children, learned how the school system operates, and served as instructors both in the classroom and at home. This enhanced the self-esteem of both parents and children. Other key elements included the quality and consistency of the teachers and the support the school provided to the project. The Magic Circle, which was introduced daily, was also cited as a highlight of the project.

Major Challenges

This project confronted two major obstacles. The first was recruiting English-only families. The project was erroneously announced in the local paper as a continuation of the Migrant Preschool Program. Before the article was published, several English-only families had enrolled but, once the article appeared, they withdrew. They resented the fact that another project was being targeted to Hispanic families when their children needed similar services. It took a fair amount of damage control to ease the tensions and encourage the families to participate. By the third year, the project became more balanced.

The other obstacle encountered was making certain the district issued the project funds in a timely manner.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Several suggestions were provided for implementing other bilingual preschool programs. They included the following:

- Gain the support of the community;
- Provide preschool staff with information about the elementary school curriculum to address the concerns of the parents;
- Provide reinforcement to the staff that they are doing a good job; and
- Engage in the Magic Circle for full-group activities.

Early Learning Fundamentals
Fremont, California

The Fremont Unified School District (FUSD), located in a suburban area outside of San Francisco, has 3,000 school-aged limited English proficient (LEP) students, mainly Hispanic and Asian. Although one of the poorest districts in California, FUSD has operated bilingual preschools and kindergartens since 1977, when the district began a transitional bilingual program for elementary schools. The structure of the preschool and kindergarten program has remained essentially consistent, with minor changes reflecting new research findings and requirements of various funding sources. The district operates four Spanish/English bilingual early childhood classes: both prekindergarten and kindergarten at Blacow and Vallejo Mills Elementary Schools. These were funded as the Early Learning Fundamentals (ELF) program by the Title VII Special Populations grant which ended in Fall 1990. The Special Populations grant also supplemented two state-sponsored sheltered English prekindergarten classes housed in Durham and Cabrillo Elementary Schools.

The children in the ELF bilingual program are predominantly native Spanish speakers with 39 percent native English speakers in 1989-90. The sheltered English children come from more than 80 different language backgrounds, including Spanish, Farsi, Japanese, and Chinese. The families come from North, Central, and South America; China--especially Taiwan; Japan; and Afghanistan. The families tend to be at low- to middle-income levels and, increasingly, both parents work.

Program Philosophy

The premise that guides the bilingual project as a whole is that facility in two languages is an asset rather than a debility. Rather than stress quick transition to English-only classes, the district provides a developmental program of Spanish and English instruction from prekindergarten through sixth grade. In 1977, when the project began, there were few bilingual preschool models to study; since then, practices and findings from the High/Scope and Head Start bilingual preschools and research by Stephen Krashen and James Cummins have influenced the development of ELF. For example, research on prekindergartens suggests that parents are integral to their children's education. Therefore, parents of ELF participants are strongly encouraged to further their own relevant skills, such as parenting and English language skills.

Project Goals

The impetus for developing the bilingual project came from elementary school staff. At the onset of the early childhood bilingual program, the teachers noticed that Hispanic children did not have the school readiness skills that native English speakers had. Therefore, the primary focus of the ELF project was to enhance school readiness skills of LEP children. To achieve this aim, goals were set for children, parents, and staff.

Children: To prepare all children to learn the skills and knowledge taught in elementary school;

To teach each child a second language;

To develop primary language skills in each child;

To teach about the culture of the different groups in our society; and

To help each child develop a positive self-image.

Parents: To involve the parents daily in their children's education.

Staff: To develop comprehensive prekindergarten and kindergarten curricula.

In the past five years, immigration into the district from diverse populations has increased dramatically. Consequently, a new goal of the project is to reach children from other non-Spanish language backgrounds more directly. To accomplish this, the district trains at least one kindergarten teacher from each school in ESL and sheltered language methodology, using materials and staff from the bilingual project.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

To recruit potential participants, the bilingual office sent a notice about the bilingual elementary program to all families with Spanish surnames and another note home with every child in the district schools. In addition, the project conducted open houses, mentioned the program in community and church gatherings, and posted flyers in schools and laundromats. Occasionally community service agencies referred families to the program. Almost all of the parents interviewed learned about the program from friends or relatives.

All new non-English speaking children in the district were sent to the district's Language Assessment Center. Four- and five-year-old children who scored an A or a B on the Idea Language Proficiency Test (IPT) were recommended for placement in the bilingual or sheltered English program, depending on their native language and degree of proficiency.

Enrollment

When parents expressed interest in the early childhood program, the prekindergarten teacher visited the home (before the school year began) to interview the parents and child. The priorities for acceptance into the ELF program were: first, children who spoke no English and came from a low-income background; second, any LEP child; and third, English-proficient children. The project attempted to enroll at least 40 percent English-proficient children. The families had to show a commitment to keep their children in the bilingual program through sixth grade.

Children in the state sheltered English program must be non-English speakers at or below the poverty level, measured by eligibility for AFDC. A waiting list was maintained for interested children who were not placed in either program.

Kindergarten class size is limited by the state to 30 students. The following chart describes enrollment for the last two years of the Special Populations grant:

Type and Level	**1988-89**	**1989-90**
Bilingual		
Prekindergarten	50	50
Kindergarten	60	60
Total	110	110
Bilingual and Sheltered English		
Prekindergarten	88	90
Kindergarten	60	60
Total	148	150

Overall, the classes were filled each year. Actual attendance was smaller than projected because the portable classroom requested for the North Plains school was not funded by the Title VII grant.

Retention

In both of the last two years of the project, 14 children left ELF without completing the year, mostly because their families moved. A few preschool children (who apparently attended the ELF program because it was the best available preschool) left the program to attend Catholic kindergartens. To retain children, teachers tried to keep parents involved in the project by talking with parents frequently and encouraging parental participation in meetings. The district allowed children in the program to remain in the program even if the family moved out of the district.

Schedules

Both the prekindergarten and the kindergarten operated on a half-day schedule five days per week through the school year. Children could attend each level for one year. In extremely unusual cases, a teacher might have recommended that a child remain in kindergarten for a second year.

An average preschool day includes the following activities.

- Greetings--informal conversation among the teachers, children, and parents, children may choose a book and "read";
- Circle time--children sing songs and review calendar information;
- Literature--the teacher reads a story in the group's native language, with the children's participation;

- Small groups--activities to develop skills in math, readiness, art, literature, and cooking;
- Lunch/Recess--develop social and motor skills;
- Whole group--the teacher reads a story and the class sings songs in the language of the day.
- Dismissal

The daily activities observed in the class and discussed in the interviews were developmentally appropriate for this age group. Children were encouraged but not forced to participate in scheduled activities. Each project developed age-appropriate skills such as small motor and prereading skills. Teachers indicated a change in activities by flickering the lights.

Instructional Strategies

The objectives of the ELF program were to help LEP and English-speaking children develop school readiness skills and build a foundation for second language development. To accomplish these objectives simultaneously, the children were taught content and skills primarily in their native language until they had developed enough proficiency to learn in the second language. The program followed a developmentally appropriate approach for this age group.

Curriculum. While funded by Title VII, ELF developed comprehensive curricula. The preschool guide contains 20 units, each covering about two weeks of instruction. The kindergarten guide contains nine monthly units. Each unit in a curriculum includes copies of the materials, such as games, songs, and literature, and a home study guide. Several curriculum themes are: "I am Special," pets, foods, and community units.

An important component of the curriculum for a multi-national group is the development of cultural awareness. The project director and teachers felt that such awareness is best developed on an individual level; dependence on large group activities for major holidays, such as a Cinco de Mayo, only encourages children to generalize and form cultural stereotypes. The project director emphasized that "each person establishes his or her culture independently." Therefore, each unit in the curriculum stressed inclusion of all types of cultures. For example, the "family" unit began with a comparison of the "Berenstein Bears" and "Goldilocks and the Three Bears," and followed with a discussion of different types of families, including cultural differences. Several parents noted that their children learned in school traditions the parents had neglected, and revived those aspects of the native culture for the whole family.

Instructional organization. Small group and individual activities occupied most of the class time. The entire class gathered for circle time and literature at the beginning and end of the day. Groups of children rotated through the learning centers for about one hour each day. Children were grouped by their primary language for most small group activities such as some learning center activities and reading; these groups were changed to reflect higher levels of English proficiency. Although children were encouraged to participate in scheduled activities, they were permitted to join and leave groups as they desired. In addition to classroom activities, the children participated in about two field trips each year.

Language Usage

Children's language facility. In each preschool class, about two or three children were completely monolingual at the beginning of the school year. Most of the other LEP children were familiar with but not proficient in English.

Classroom observations and interviews. Whole group activities, including circle time at the beginning and literature time at the end of the day, were conducted in the language of the day, which alternated between Spanish and English. If a child was unable to communicate in the language of the day, his or her primary language was acceptable. For example, the teacher guided one Hispanic girl through show-and-tell in Spanish after the girl did not respond to English questions. Children quickly learned instructions in their second language, as the basic structure of the class remained the same regardless of language of instruction. Native English speakers in one class listened to Spanish directions during circle time and conveyed them in Spanish to native Spanish speakers. In small group and individual activities, such as learning centers, reading, and exploration time, the children were instructed in their primary language supplemented with sheltered Spanish or English.

Equal status of the Spanish and English languages was ensured by:

- Appropriate materials in all subject areas in both languages;
- Displays in both languages;
- Children's work in both languages on display; and
- Daily Spanish, Spanish as a second language (SSL), ESL, and English reading and language development instruction.

Materials and Equipment

The classrooms were well-equipped and materials were appropriate for prekindergarten and kindergarten children.

- Room arrangements were conducive to learning: The classrooms contained a sufficient number of child-sized furniture for all of the children, and sofa or rug areas set aside for reading. In some classrooms, the displays were mainly commercial; in others, children's work predominated.
- Materials provided language/reasoning experience: Spanish and English books and tapes/records were available in every classroom. Displays were multilingual.
- Equipment and materials promoted motor activities: At least one group activity (e.g., macaroni pictures), in each class developed fine motor skills; beads, puzzles, blocks, and other materials provided further fine motor skill development. The outdoor play areas included climbers, swings, ride-on cars, slides, and other equipment designed to enhance gross motor skills.

- Materials were available for creative activities: Art and music equipment and dramatic play props were available.

- Environment and materials promoted social development: Displays and materials showed people and cultures of different countries. Large group, small group, and areas to be alone are part of every classroom.

Non-Instructional Services

ELF participants had access to all school services available to other elementary students. For example, the kindergarten at Vallejo Mills used the school's math, computer, and science labs. A representative from UCA Extension made an annual presentation on nutrition. Parents were invited to request individual assistance from her. For other services, the district bilingual program provided translators and transportation when needed. All children in the schools, including the very young, received hearing and vision screenings. In addition to these services, the director would like to hire a consultant to design a psychological assessment for children.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Evaluation of the children relied most heavily on teacher observation, using a preschool readiness inventory developed by the bilingual project. The Project ELF School Readiness Inventory used as a pre- and post-test, measures growth rather than mastery using the child's primary language. The post-test also measures second language acquisition. The Pre-IPT is used as a pre- and post-test for language development.

For the most part, children achieved the objectives of the program: most moved from level A to level C on the Pre-IPT; learned their colors, numbers, parts of the body, et cetera; and learned how to behave in the school environment. Kindergarten teachers who receive ELF prekindergarten graduates have noticed that the children understand how to function in a classroom. Parents have noticed increases in their children's English and Spanish vocabulary.

Follow-Up Evaluations

Because the early learning project is under the aegis of the bilingual director, child progress was closely observed from prekindergarten through sixth grade. ELF graduates were tracked both objectively and subjectively: the bilingual director maintained a list of these children, checked their Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills scores every spring, and visited at least one bilingual classroom every day. From this information, the director developed a picture of how individual children were progressing, and of the success of the program as a whole. Although children seemed to have made progress, the informal nature of this review precludes citing actual test scores.

Almost all ELF children continued in the bilingual program through sixth grade. Because this was a developmental program, emphasizing true acquisition of both Spanish and English, late transition to an English-only classroom was evidence of success, not failure. Although LEP children lagged in test scores in the early grades, by fourth or fifth grade ELF LEP graduates and English-speaking children performed equally well.

Staff

Qualifications

ELF was staffed by the bilingual director, the project director, four bilingual teachers, and four bilingual aides. All of the staff spoke Spanish and English fluently and, except for one White teacher, all were Hispanic. The two kindergarten teachers worked full time; all other instructional staff worked part time. There was very little turnover in staff; one paraprofessional left in 1988 to work in a different grade.

Professional qualifications for instructional staff in ELF and in the sheltered English preschool were the same: all four preschool teachers had California Child Development Permits; both kindergarten teachers had K-8 Multiple Subjects Credentials with Bilingual Emphasis; and all six paraprofessionals had passed the District Exam for Bilingual Instructional Aides. The teachers' classroom experience ranged from five to 25 years, and the paraprofessionals had three to 12 years of early childhood education experience.

In hiring, the director looked for teachers who were flexible and who believed that all children have the potential to learn. Finding qualified and personable teachers has proven a problem. The aides were strongly encouraged to further their education in order to become teachers in the program, and some high school students and parents were encouraged to study to become aides. In fact, several of the aides and teachers were students in the bilingual program themselves.

Volunteers were used regularly in the project. Parents helped supervise learning centers almost every day, usually working with children in small groups. At times, Latin American parents have shared games and food from their home culture with the class. Some students from the upper grades participated in Project Write; the young children told stories which the older students transcribed. Both groups developed skills through this project.

Training

In 1989-90, project staff attended 10 workshops. Topics included: integrated instruction, primary language instruction, sheltered English academy, whole language, English language development, small group management, integrating literature, and multicultural education. The workshops were provided by district staff and local universities, and most were funded jointly by the district and the ELF project. College credit was awarded for training provided at the universities.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

The bilingual project offered extensive opportunities for parents to be involved. Parents of ELF children were very active in the district Bilingual Advisory Committee and school advisory committees, ESL and parenting classes, and parent workshops. They also volunteered to help in the classroom and with field trips and school festivals.

ESL classes. Classes for parents were offered by Project Encouragement, a Fremont parent training project, at the Adult School Instruction Center, the same site where their children's language skills were assessed. Parents could take ESL classes twice a week for two hours per class or four times a week for three hours per class. Eleven ELF parents participated in the shorter class and five in the longer class in the 1989-90 school year. Project PELT supplied child care during some classes to facilitate attendance.

Parent workshops. Nineteen ELF families participated in a weekly intergenerational class which focused on thematic instruction, parents as teachers, ESL, and parenting skills. In addition, two parent workshops were offered in the 1989-90 school year: ELF orientation and a homework workshop. The homework workshop, in which parents made boxes for their children's tools, was very popular among the parents.

Family workshops. During the school year, family workshops were offered once a week. In these workshops, parents learned parenting skills while their children played, and then parents and children together participated in learning activities. Parents also were told of projects they could do at home with their child. Nineteen ELF families participated in the Project PELT Summer School Family Program which covered four themes: family, nutrition, transportation, and zoo animals. This class met eight times and conducted four family field trips.

Advisory council. Although there was no advisory council specifically for the ELF project, 12 parents participated in the district Bilingual Advisory Committee.

Parent-teacher interaction. Parents initially discussed the project with the teacher in the home visit prior to fall enrollment. During each year there was one scheduled parent-teacher conference and others as needed. Parents joined class activities regularly: they volunteered in the classroom a total of 1,378 hours in the last year, chaperoned the two annual field trips, and contributed time, materials, and food for the school's annual Spring Fiesta.

Participation in project-related activities has had peripheral effects on the parents. Many became more willing to be involved in the education of their children, as was evident by increased participation in the PTA, higher volunteer rates in first grade, and assertiveness in interactions with the teachers. The daily homework required parents to spend some time working with their children on instructional activities. Parents were using and sharing their abilities more: two parents sewed about 100 costumes for a school festival. Parents were developing new skills: more women learned to drive, and increased English skills have enabled some parents to get better jobs.

The bilingual project welcomed support from the community at large, in addition to the parents. The Hispanic Coalition for Better Education worked closely with the Bilingual Advisory Committee to channel committee needs and requests to the community. For example, the Coalition helped obtain speakers for school assemblies.

Educational Linkages

The district and the bilingual office cooperate on funding the early childhood bilingual project. While the project was funded by Title VII, the district paid for transportation, the facilities, utilities, and custodial services. Title VII funded the teachers, aides, and curriculum development for ELF. In addition, the Special Populations grant financed aides in the two state sheltered English preschools, and the ELF curriculum was given to the state preschool teachers.

The transition from prekindergarten to kindergarten was easy for the children: the teachers had been trained to use complementary curricula, and one kindergarten was in the same room as the prekindergarten. In May, children from the bilingual kindergartens joined the first grade classrooms to listen to the teacher read a story to facilitate transition to first grade. The kindergarten and first-grade teachers reviewed ELF graduates' files together at the end of the year.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

Although the primary funding source for the ELF project was the Special Populations Grant, school district support and an Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance entitlement supplemented the Title VII grant. In Program Year (PY) 1989-90, the project was funded by the following sources:

- Special Populations Grant--$106,720;
- District Kindergarten Allocation--$165,648;
- District In-Kind Contributions (e.g., classroom, utilities)--$37,900; and
- Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance--$2,264.

In addition, services funded through other sources, such as ESL classes for LEP parents offered by the Bilingual Office, were available to ELF participants and their families.

The most significant expenditure for the project was salaries, which totalled $79,028 in PY 1989-90.

Future Project Capacity

The preschool and kindergarten were originally funded for five years by a Transitional Bilingual Education grant, and then by National Demonstration project funds. ELF completed its third year of the three-year Special Populations funding cycle in fall 1990. It is now being continued under another three-year Transitional Bilingual Education grant. The bilingual director has been very successful in locating and obtaining relevant grants, and hopes to continue funding the project in this way.

According to the district finance office, the district can support the bilingual kindergarten with its own funds but could not afford to fund the bilingual prekindergarten fully. Earlier district-wide training of kindergarten teachers, administrators, and principals in the goals and methods of bilingual education could facilitate continuation of the project. Good communication with parents has been established, and parents have begun to feel empowered enough to get involved in a recent strike in support of the teachers. In addition, a comprehensive bilingual preschool curriculum has been developed in the three years of Title VII funding; sales of the curriculum might help support the prekindergarten.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Overall, most ELF staff felt that the factor which most contributed to the success of the project was continuity. Clear statement of initial goals, consistent oversight and guidance toward achieving those goals, a well-developed core curriculum, and stable, experienced, well-trained staff ensured an efficient and effective program. Other factors that influenced the success of the ELF project were:

- Parent education and involvement;
- Support from district administrators and principals; and
- Easy transition to elementary school.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The bilingual director suggested that new projects be developed with strong underlying structure in which every component is planned to lead to school readiness, and the needs of the population being served are considered. The structure should be based on sound research, rather than current popular trends in education. Other administrators noted the importance of garnering parental support and firm commitments from the staff early in the project, and carefully engineering integration of the prekindergarten program with the housing school. Finally, the district, not just the project, should be committed to bilingual education.

Red School House, Inc. Abenujee Preschool Project
St. Paul, Minnesota

The Red School House Abenujee Preschool Project was a three-year project serving low-income Native American three and four year olds in St. Paul, Minnesota. Most of these children spoke English as a first language but lacked full proficiency because Ojibway or Dakota was the language of the home. The project was housed in a single building, the Red School House, which also housed kindergarten to twelfth grade and adult education programs for Native Americans, and was directed by the school administrative coordinator.

Program Philosophy

This project was directed to children of Native American heritage and attempted to build familiarity with Native American languages and cultures. The Anise teaching model, which recognizes that parents are the most influential educators of their children, served as the basis of the preschool program. Methodology and design were continually evaluated and updated based on current research from the state department of education, the University of Minnesota, the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, and the Regional Support Center.

Project Goals

The project goals were directed to children and their parents.

Children: To increase English language skills of 85 percent of the LEP participants.

To increase school readiness skills of 85 percent of the LEP participants.

To provide a social environment conducive for whole child growth.

Parents: To involve parents in learning activities.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

As the preschool project was originally requested by parents of older students at the Red School House, many parents were aware of and interested in the project from the onset. Other parents were informed of the Abenujee project through an annual open house, advertisements in Native American newspapers, and a brochure. In addition, the St. Paul Public Schools Early Childhood Team assisted in screening potential participants from applicants to St. Paul prekindergartens. Children were admitted to the program in the order they had applied; a waiting list was maintained for this purpose. Relative language ability and economic status were not factors in admitting children.

Enrollment

Abenujee proposed to serve a total of 40 to 60 children in prekindergarten and kindergarten each year. Attendance averaged 25 children through the three years of the project.

The total number of children served, which is unavailable, was substantially higher for two reasons: some children attended morning sessions only and were replaced by different children in the afternoon; and the retention rate was low, but the replacement rate was high. For example, in the first quarter of a year, 25 children might attend the morning session. Three might go home at midday, and three different children might join the class for the afternoon. In this example, 25 children were in class at any given time, but a total of 28 children were enrolled per day. In addition, two children might leave the area in the second quarter of the year, and two new children might enroll to fill the slots, thus bringing the enrollment numbers for the first semester to 30 participants. (Note: this scenario does not describe the true numbers of children enrolled in Abenujee, as these numbers are unavailable.) All of the children were from low income families.

Retention

Each year, a number of children who enrolled in the program left without completing the year. Generally, this was because the family had moved; although the Native American community can be tight-knit in the St. Paul area, moves within and from the community are fairly frequent. The project attempted to counter the problem by promoting a sense of family in the school, with the expectation that stronger bonds with the school would encourage families to remain in the area. Slots created by departing children were quickly filled with children from a long waiting list.

Schedules

The Abenujee project operated on a full-day schedule, from 9:00a.m. to 3:30p.m., broken down into a morning and afternoon session. Children attended five days per week, 40 weeks per year. Some children attended full-time, while others attended for half-days only. Children who had parents at home during the day were only permitted to attend a morning or afternoon session. In this way, more slots were available to serve more children. Beginning in the 1990-91 school year, children will leave an hour early on Mondays and Fridays.

Instructional Strategies

Instructional strategies were designed to help children develop social skills, a sense of Native American culture, English language skills, and a strong self-concept. An individual education plan was developed for each child, and progress in that plan served as a measure of school success.

Learning centers. Discovery centers were developed to increase English language understanding and speaking through creative play. Learning centers included:

- Playhouse, bank, store, and doctor's office;
- Book center;
- Guessing boxes;
- Music center;
- Computer center;
- Listening center; and
- Individual box area.

In addition to learning centers, instructional activities included listening to stories and tapes, working with flannel boards, learning to use computers, and participating in a drug free school program. Approximately one-third of each week was spent in large group activities such as Circle Time and art; more than one-fourth of the week was spent in learning centers and small group activities. Native American culture was emphasized through many of these activities and through the weekly tobacco ceremony.

Grouping. Children were not grouped either by language proficiency or by ability levels. Most children spoke English upon entering the program and group instruction was in English. Bilingual aides translated to the non-English language when necessary.

Curriculum. The curriculum used in the program was the DIAL kit. Within this curriculum the classes followed themes such as seasons and holidays. Instruction focused on cultural perspectives of the class themes. For example, in the fall, the class might explore traditional fall Ojibway activities.

Materials and Equipment

The equipment and instructional materials used in this project were selected to:

- Improve vocabulary and concepts;
- Enhance English syntax; and
- Develop visual and motor skills.

Equipment development centered on the classroom computer and speech synthesis software.

Non-Instructional Services

A number of non-instructional services were provided by the local education association, the Red School House, and the Indian Health Board. For example, the public schools provided a nurse to come and speak about nutrition, the Indian Health Board supplied emergency and routine health care and, in the last year, the Red School House employed a physical education instructor who spoke with the children about health. Children needing counseling received it in the program, and the school provided referral services for parental counseling and other social services unavailable through the school. Transportation to and from the preschool was provided by the Red School House.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Children were tested three times each year: upon entering the program and at the end of the first and second semesters. Because no single test has proven psychometrically ideal for the Native American population, the Abenujee project used multiple assessment instruments. Teacher observation and checklists, parent questionnaires, and standardized inventories were used to measure participant progress. Tests administered in the fall of each project year or at the time of enrollment to determine children's strengths and weaknesses included the:

- Stanford Early School Achievement Test, which measures cognitive development and aural comprehension, administered to five year olds (1987-89),

- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), which evaluates language and concept development and cognitive language skills, administered to four and five year olds (1987-89),

- Houghton Mifflin Test, which is used to determine remedial needs at an early age (1988-89),

- Wide Range Achievement Test, which measures school readiness (1989-90),

- Minnesota Preschool Survey, which measures school readiness for four year olds (1988-90),

- Early School Inventory--Developmental, which measures school readiness for five year olds and distinguishes LEP from learning disabled (1987-90), and

- Denver Developmental Screening Test, which measures school readiness, and was given as a pre- and post-test (1988-89).

On-going assessments were conducted weekly through teacher observations using the Early Classroom Observation form. This assessment was used to identify children who had reached proficiency goals. At that point, the PPVT was administered again on an individual basis to determine readiness for the regular school program. All children still enrolled in the program at the end of the second semester were given the Denver Developmental Screening Test a second time.

On a teacher-made school readiness scale of one to five, most participants moved from level one to level three. According to the preschool specialist, 27 and 25 participants benefitted from the project by the end of the first quarter of the 1987-88 and 1988-89 project years respectively. More specific results of testing were not submitted for this project review.

Follow-Up Evaluations

Student progress after leaving the preschool program was tracked informally. The preschool teacher discussed the children with the kindergarten teacher frequently, especially at the weekly staff meetings. This was feasible because the Red School House is small and all classes are housed in the same building. Although it is too early in the project to be very useful, retention rates will be used as an indicator of student success.

Two participants were placed in English-only kindergartens each of the first two years of the project. The third year, five children were mainstreamed. The remaining children attended the Red School House Kindergarten. In this kindergarten, core classroom instruction is in English, and cultural activities are conducted in Dakota or Ojibway. These numbers do not imply that the other children each year had failed to acquire skills necessary for mainstream classes; enrollment in bilingual kindergarten is consistent with a major function of the Red School House, developing Indian language skills.

Staff

Qualifications

The project staff consisted of one full-time teacher and one full-time paraprofessional aide. In the 1989-90 project year, the paraprofessional and teacher were Native American. A brief description of the staff characteristics and qualifications follows.

- White Earth Chippewa Teacher: Certified in Early Childhood Education; 15 years experience; proficient in Ojibway.

- Hopi Paraprofessional: Three years of teaching experience; proficient in Hopi.

There was no teacher turnover in the prekindergarten class.

Parents volunteered to help in the classrooms. Generally, they worked with a small group that included their own child.

Training

Training for the teachers and paraprofessionals was conducted primarily by school staff, and secondarily by area colleges and consultants. Training sessions were funded by the entire school rather than one particular project; in some cases, parent stipends helped finance the training.

Because there were so few project staff, training sessions were generally open to all Red School House staff. Topics of in-service training sessions included:

- Cooperative education;
- Parent development;
- Language awareness and development;
- Human relations;
- Social skills;
- Board topics;
- Assertive discipline; and
- Gangs.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

The Red School House as a whole has a very strong parent component. Preschool parents are involved in school-wide parent activities; the preschool project itself did not offer a separate, comprehensive parent component.

Classes. The school operates an adult learning center that provides year-round, daily ABE/GED classes. These classes were offered through the school, but not through the project. The early childhood project did not sponsor any parent training. ESL classes are not provided as most of the parents speak English as a first language. The Red School House offers transportation assistance, on-site child care, paid test fees and client advocacy as part of this program.

Parent workshops. Abenujee parents attended monthly workshops in early childhood development and home learning activities to enhance their abilities to assist in their children's education.

Advisory council. Up to now, parents have not formally participated in Abenujee development, but have participated in school-wide development. The educational subcommittee, which works on the Abenujee curriculum, has not included parents; there is currently a strong movement in that direction. However, parents do guide school development; in fact, they voiced the original request for a bilingual preschool program. They continue to provide school development suggestions at Red School House community feasts four times per year and to serve as members of the school board.

Parent-teacher interaction. The prekindergarten teachers visited approximately 75 percent of the children's homes two times last year to talk with the parents. When a child was ready to transfer to a non-bilingual program, the parents and teacher met to discuss the child's progress and needs. On their part, parents volunteered on an individual basis to chaperon field trips or work with small groups in the classroom. Over the course of the project, parent participation steadily increased.

Educational Linkages

The Abenujee project was fully integrated into the Red School House. All the facilities of the school were available to project participants on a prorated basis. The prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers worked closely together, even sharing a classroom. Schoolwide events such as the tobacco ceremony enabled the children to have regular interactions with their future teacher and students already in kindergarten.

The linkage between the Abenujee project and the local elementary schools was also strong. Abenujee staff maintained ongoing communication with public school personnel and gave kindergarten teachers student records from the prekindergarten. In turn, the district provided the Red School House with health and special education language services. In addition, Project Link-Up brings together local Indian education staff and projects--including Abenujee--for better transitions between programs and coordination of goals.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

All direct costs for this project were financed by the Title VII Special Populations Grant. Facilities and operating costs, including utilities, telephone, insurance, and printing, were funded by this grant on a prorated basis.

Future Project Capacity

Although the project is currently operating, Federal funding for the Abenujee Preschool project ended in August, 1990. The Red School House is currently operating the project under a Title V grant, and plans to continue the project in the same capacity, contingent on further funding. The school is applying for a Title VII Special Populations continuation grant and a Head Start grant.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Four elements played a significant role in the success of this preschool project: the stability of the instructional staff, the integrated curriculum, transportation, and the drug-free schools program. The teacher and aide, who worked with Abenujee from its inception, ensured continuity of instruction. The curriculum--based on a daily schedule with regular enhancement activities such as computer labs and cultural time--created a healthy, well-rounded educational environment. Separate transportation provided by the school enabled children to attend without being intimidated in transit by older children. Finally, the drug-free schools program helped the children develop the strong sense of self-esteem especially important in a minority culture.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Recommendations for beginning bilingual preschool projects concerned staff and scheduling. The director of Red School House suggested that projects hire staff who speak the language of the children. Scheduling is also important: a good program should operate on a full day schedule and should include a variety of areas to develop a well-rounded child.

Community School District 2 Project P.E.P.
Preschool English Proficiency
Manhattan, New York

Project P.E.P. was a three-year Special Populations Preschool Project serving two low-income populations -- a limited English proficient (LEP) Chinese population and an English-speaking black and Hispanic population -- in the Lower East Side of Manhattan. The LEP children, who came from recently arrived immigrant families, had no understanding of English and were unable to speak any English upon entering the program. Approximately 60 percent of the children served each year were LEP. Approximately 95 percent of all the children served were below the federal poverty level as defined in the family application for free lunch. The project, which served four-year-olds, was administered by District 2 and housed in P.S. 1, in the Chinatown section of New York City.

Program Philosophy

The project was designed to foster second language acquisition and fluency using a wide variety of developmentally appropriate activities. These activities were designed to nurture the child and provide the opportunity for active learning. The overall framework for the project was based on New York City's Project Giant Step and on guidelines from the Early Childhood Unit of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction of the New York City Board of Education.

Project Goals

The project goals were directed to both children and parents.

Pupils:	To provide activities that will nurture children and that are developmentally appropriate;
	To provide a positive early school experience;
	To produce pupils who will be able to function in an English-speaking public school system;
	To develop school readiness skills such as listening, reading, and dressing self.
Parents:	To understand the importance of early childhood education and English language development;
	To know the importance of parental participation in the educational process.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

A variety of techniques were used to inform the community about the project. They included the following:

- Letters to parents of P.S. 1 children informing them of the services;
- Meetings with both the school Parental Advisory Council and the Parent Association outlining the project;
- Community news media; and
- Word of mouth.

Because each year more parents expressed interest in the project than could be accommodated, a list of eligible children was compiled based on the criteria below. Children had to be from:

- Families within the attendance zone of P.S. 1;
- Families with limited English language background;
- Families that are economically disadvantaged; and/or
- Community School District 2 families whose zoned schools did not have a prekindergarten program with appropriate bilingual services.

A committee composed of project teachers, the school neighborhood worker, the district prekindergarten coordinator, and the school principal participated in the selection process. All eligible children were interviewed together with their parents. The final selection was made with consideration of composition to ensure equitable representation of sex, racial/ethnic, and language groups. Applicants who could not be accommodated initially were placed on a waiting list. As project participants moved out of the neighborhood, waiting list applicants were selected to fill the slots.

Enrollment

Project P.E.P enrolled a total of 30 children each year. There were 15 children in each of its two prekindergarten classes.

Retention

Each year, approximately six children who enrolled in the program left without completing the year because their families moved from the community. Frequent movement is common in this immigrant neighborhood, where once the family earns enough money, they move to less crowded surroundings.

Schedules

The project operated two full-day classes from 8:40 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. five days per week. The day was generally divided into the following activities:

- Arrival, greetings, informal conversation
- Work/Play period
- Story time/creative dramatics
- Active play (indoors or outdoors)
- Singing songs
- Preparation for lunch
- Quiet time and rest
- Work/Play period
- Music/Movement/Creative dramatics (indoors or outdoors)
- Snack and conversation
- End of day discussions and distribution of work and notices

Instructional Strategies

The Project P.E.P. curriculum was designed to foster the participants' cognitive, physical, social, and affective development. Teachers worked together to plan the curriculum each year. Two to three major themes were introduced that were integrated into a variety of subject areas. In the past year, for example, children were introduced to colors. That theme was carried out in science, cooking, and other subject areas. Another theme centered around the "self". Children talked about their names, age, body parts, family members, and other items that centered around the "self".

The activities that the children engaged in were child-centered and developmentally appropriate. Literacy was encouraged through sharing experiences, having discussions, interacting, feeling comfortable, taking risks, asking questions, making discoveries, exploring new materials, answering questions, and expressing feelings. Cognitive development was encouraged through looking at books, playing games, reciting rhymes, singing songs, matching letters, dictating stories, developing concepts, sequencing events, engaging in dramatic play, listening to stories and poems, looking at pictures, and learning to write. The physical environment stimulated language skills through the use of signs, posters, magazines, charts, bulletin boards, labels, books, alphabet letters, writing tools, children's name tags, toys, manipulative materials, games, and play equipment.

Although the LEP children did not speak English, the teacher and paraprofessional always spoke to the children in English. Even during story hour, the story was read in English. Chinese was only spoken when the children could not understand the English.

Activity centers. Classrooms were organized into different centers of activity. Among the centers were housekeeping, block areas, sand and water table, live animals, and manipulative toys. Children were encouraged to explore each of these areas in order to broaden their experiences. The centers fostered academic readiness (e.g., manipulatives reinforced math; water and sand reinforced science) and language development and the development of social skills. Children spent about 85 percent of their day working and playing in these centers.

In addition to the centers, individualized instruction, small and large group instruction, and whole-group activities were provided. Individualized instruction was provided on an as-needed basis. Whole-group activities were scheduled for the beginning of the day when children first arrived, and at the end of the day when children were ready to return home.

Grouping. Children were not grouped either by English or native language proficiency or by ability levels. The children chose with whom they would work and play.

Materials and Equipment

The equipment and materials used in the project were developmentally appropriate and suitable for the health and safety needs of four-year-olds. They included:

- Library books in Spanish and Chinese that encourage parent-child home reading in LEP families;
- Kitchen equipment to encourage classroom cooking experiences;
- Audiovisual equipment; and
- Materials to promote exploration and creativity including dress-up material, and activities for the science and math centers.

Non-Instructional Services

Various non-instructional services were offered to project participants. These were not specifically funded by the project. City, state, and federal funds provided a free breakfast and lunch to all eligible participants. The children had access to a dental screening program through New York University Dental School. A school bus took the children to the university for these services. All other services available to students at P.S. 1, such as the school nurse, were made available to project participants. Local social workers referred families to community resources.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Participant progress in school readiness and developmental skills was measured by teacher observations and a developmental checklist. The items on the checklist corresponded to the child's development in the following areas:

- Personal and social development (e.g., puts on own clothes, recognizes own name and other children's names, follows class rules, shares with others, tries new things.)

- Physical development (e.g., uses large muscles to hop, run, climb; uses small muscles to cut with scissors, paste, manipulate materials such as puzzles.)

- Intellectual development (e.g., expresses curiosity, understands basic concepts such as up/down, big/little, counts from 1 to 5, uses sentences averaging 5 or 6 words, identifies common objects, retells a story.)

- Other languages (e.g., relates incidents in simple English, talks freely to other children, identifies common objects, speaks in understandable manner.)

- Creative expression (e.g., simple songs, experiments with art materials, dramatizes simple stories.)

Each item on the checklist was discussed by the staff (teachers, paraprofessionals, project coordinator) and matched with each child. Ninety percent of the participants accomplished these tasks, but no numbers were available on child progress in each checklist area.

Follow-Up Evaluations

When participants enter kindergarten at P.S. 1 their language proficiency skills will be measured. Staff-developed tests will determine their proficiency in their native language skills. The Language Assessment Battery (LAB) developed by the New York City Board of Education will determine their English language proficiency. To date, no data are available.

Prior to September 1990, there were no bilingual kindergartens at P.S. 1. All of the LEP project participants were placed in mainstreamed kindergarten classes. In 1990 participants were also placed in mainstreamed kindergartens as the new bilingual class was reserved for new LEP admissions to the school.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

The project staff consisted of three full-time, bilingual, Chinese-speaking teachers; two full-time, bilingual, Hispanic paraprofessionals; and one full-time, bilingual, Chinese school neighborhood worker. The staff remained with the program over the course of the project. The teachers had Early Childhood Education licenses and previous experience in community day care agencies under the Head Start Program. The paraprofessionals, who were required to have a minimum of six college credits, served primarily as teaching assistants. They assisted in classroom routines, worked with small or large groups or individual children, and helped implement the curriculum.

The school neighborhood worker provided the link between school and home. She was responsible for home contacts and telephone conferences with parents, parent involvement activities, attendance records and follow-up of absenteeism, escort services in emergencies, and parent contact at home or work if an emergency arose at school. She directed resources and disseminated information from the school, community, and the city at large to the parents and made certain that all communications, oral or written, were in the language understood by the parents.

Parents served as volunteers in the project. One parent volunteered one full day in the classroom on a rotating basis to assist the teacher, help prepare instructional materials, and plan culturally relevant activities.

Training

The early childhood coordinator of Community School District 2 was responsible for the coordination of staff development activities. One day per month, when children did not attend school, teachers were required to attend staff development activities offered through the New York City Board of Education. No data were provided on the training topics or the number of project staff attending. Periodically, the district offered in-service training, but no data were available on the number of times services were provided or the training topics. The early childhood coordinator is no longer with the district, and the district office has changed locations, making it difficult to obtain further information. The project provided stipends for teachers and paraprofessionals attending staff development workshops provided by the school district.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

Parents participated in a variety of activities that were associated with this project, although not necessarily funded through this project. Parents who participated in the preschool project appeared to continue to remain involved with the school once their children left the program.

Family English Literacy Program. The district received Title VII funds to develop a Family English Literacy Program for parents of LEP children. Parents were taught English by learning what children were learning in school. Classes were offered twice a week, from 3:30p.m. to 6:30p.m. Four classes are offered with a total registration of 20 parents; approximately 15 non-working parents regularly attended these workshops, including a number of P.E.P. parents. To facilitate parent's participation, one of the P.E.P. teachers received additional pay to care for the children after 3:00p.m. Approximately 18 children, including P.E.P. participants, attended this day care program. The lack of additional child care limited the number of parents who could participate.

Parent workshops. Parents attended workshops organized by the school neighborhood worker. Approximately five workshops were offered during the course of the year. Workshop activities varied. One session was devoted to parenting skills. At other sessions community workers, such as police officers or social workers, were invited to talk about safety and community resources.

School activities. Parents participated in a variety of school activities. They volunteered in classrooms, participated in ethnic festivals, did fundraising (white elephant sale), and worked in the parents room where, in general, they made instructional materials for the children.

Educational Linkages

Project P.E.P. was integrally linked to Community School District 2 and P.S. 1. The early childhood coordinator was responsible for coordinating and managing the project under the supervision of the director of bilingual programs. Both positions were funded by the district. Funds from other Title VII programs at the school, such as the Family English Language Program, were used to provide services to project participants.

Project participants had access to all of the services, equipment, and facilities in the school. Project teachers worked closely with kindergarten teachers in placing project participants in kindergarten classes.

Fiscal Operations

No data on project costs were provided. Project activities were supported by other funds received by the school to provide services for prekindergarten children. These funds came from the district, Giant Step (a program funded by the New York City Mayor's office), or the state. No data was available on the amount of funds provided through other sources or their specific uses. District funds, however, generally support non-instructional services and staff development. Other grant monies support a Family English Literacy Program in which project parents have enrolled.

Future Project Capacity

This project was not continued with the termination of federal funds.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

The knowledge, enthusiasm and quality of the teachers were key to making this project a success. Teachers were supportive of each other and worked well together planning the program. They were able to assess the needs of the children and work with them accordingly.

Major Challenges

Involving low-income, poorly educated, working parents was the most challenging aspect of this project.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The major recommendation for any preschool project was having safe, adequate indoor and outdoor space for project activities.

District 30 Preschool Special Populations Education Program
for Limited English Proficient Children
Queens, New York

The District 30 Title VII Special Populations Preschool Program was a three-year project serving low-income limited English proficient (LEP) Greek and Hispanic four-year-olds in Long Island City, Queens, New York. These children, who came from immigrant families, had little or no understanding of English, and were unable to speak any English upon entering the program. The project was administered by the Supervisor of Bilingual Education who coordinated all bilingual and ESL programs throughout the district. It was housed in two public schools: P.S. 70 housed the Greek-speaking program and P.S. 76 housed the Spanish-speaking program. The principal of each school directly supervised the Title VII staff in the school.

Program Philosophy

The overall framework for the project was suggested by the Early Childhood Unit of the Office of Curriculum and Instruction of the New York City Board of Education and conformed to the New York State Department of Education requirements for preschool programs. Head Start research, particularly related to organizing classrooms in learning centers, also contributed to the design of the project.

Project Goals

The project goals were directed to specific target populations.

Pupils: To produce pupils who will become functionally literate in English.

To create a positive attitude toward school and toward learning.

Staff: To develop in bilingual teachers and paraprofessionals specialized knowledge necessary to instruct LEP preschoolers through the use of learning centers.

To develop in bilingual teachers specialized knowledge in methods and strategies and use of materials for instructing LEP preschoolers.

To develop in bilingual paraprofessionals the administrative skills and competencies necessary for the proper operation of the program.

Parents: To develop greater facility in the English language through the use of ESL classes.

To develop and maintain an active and continuous parental involvement project.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

A team consisting of the district supervisor of bilingual education, district coordinator of early childhood education, the Chapter 53 screening administrator, the health education coordinator, the principals, the Title VII teachers, the social worker, family workers, community agencies, and other district office staff (such as the supervising nurse and the director of pupil personnel services) was responsible for pupil recruitment. Information was disseminated through the target schools, Parent-Teachers' Associations, community agencies, local churches, and medical and health centers. Flyers were placed in supermarkets, libraries, and other public buildings, and sent home with children in the lower grade LEP program who had younger siblings. Press releases were sent to local newspapers including the Greek and Spanish newspapers.

Prior to enrollment, teachers and paraprofessionals met with the parents at each participating school to inform them of the goals and instructional design of the project. Eligible children were enrolled according to the Title VII guidelines as defined in 34 CFR Part 500 of the Bilingual Education Regulations. After application by the pupils' parents, the neediest were chosen in terms of lack of English language proficiency and economic disadvantage. Attention was given to selecting an equal number of boys and girls and, whenever possible, handicapped pupils whose handicap would not prevent them from participating fully in the program.

Enrollment

District 30 estimated that approximately 72 children would be served each year, 36 Greek-speaking children at P.S. 70 and 36 Spanish speaking children at P.S. 76. Enrollment, however, was lower than anticipated. The reason cited was the lack of free transportation.

The following chart provides information on enrollment by school:

School	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90
P.S. 70	25	21	26
P.S. 76	30	31	34
Total	**55**	**52**	**60**

Retention

In the last year of project operation, five children, one from P.S. 70 and four from P.S. 76 left the program without completing the year because their families moved from the community. Frequent movement is common in this immigrant neighborhood.

Schedules

Participants at each school were divided into two different sessions. A morning session was offered for one group of children and an afternoon session was offered for a different group of children--four days per week from 8:40a.m. to 11:20a.m., and 12:20p.m. to 2:50p.m., respectively. One teacher taught both sessions at each school. Fridays were reserved for parent workshops and staff development activities. Children remained in the program for one year before entering kindergarten.

Instructional Strategies

Instructional strategies were designed to help children learn to communicate in English, develop independence and self-esteem, and foster social, emotional, and intellectual development.

Learning centers. The major instructional approach in the classroom was the use of learning centers. During the course of the day, children were encouraged to make an independent choice as to which center they preferred for work and play. The following centers were set up:

- The housekeeping center;
- The block center;
- The art center;
- The science center;
- The music and physical activities center; and
- The library and stories listening center.

In addition to the centers, instructional activities included audiotape directed lessons, filmstrips, duplicating masters, stories and nursery rhymes, puzzles, and games. The children's own culture was emphasized throughout the curriculum in the form of stories, songs, ethnic celebrations and a variety of visual materials designed to develop skills and enhance self-image. Children spent approximately 50 percent of each day in the learning centers; however, the specific amount of time varied with the individual child's needs. Some children, for example, needed individualized instruction daily, while others did not.

Grouping. Children were not grouped either by English or native language proficiency or by ability levels. At the beginning of the program year there was very little variation in the children's proficiency in English. When the program first began, teachers emphasized the child's native language but, as English proficiency increased, more English was used. However, the native language was always reinforced in the classes through songs, stories, and other activities.

Curriculum. The curriculum used in the project was written by the New York City Board of Education for prekindergarten children. This curriculum guide, Three, Four, Open the Door, emphasized language development. Language instruction focused on naming objects, analysis of the relationship of parts to the whole, construction of identity statements, defining categories, and conversing with adults and other children. The songs, poetry, and dramatization provided opportunities for children to develop and internalize oral language syntax, semantics, and meaningful vocabulary. Children learned English by using the language in meaningful, functional ways, such as by asking questions, making statements about themselves, expressing their ideas and feelings, and making requests of others.

Materials and Equipment

The equipment and instructional materials used in the project and arranged in the learning centers were selected to:

- Develop a sense of mastery and body coordination through the use of large muscle groups (by using balls, jump ropes, tricycles, et cetera);
- Develop creative expression through the use of paints, easels, brushes, paper, housekeeping furniture, props, et cetera;
- Understand the world about them through the enjoyment of books, pictures, records, and centers of interest where the children can create the world; and
- Explore appropriate and interesting science and math ideas through classroom pets, aquaria, math manipulatives, stacking and sorting of blocks, et cetera.

Non-Instructional Services

Various non-instructional services were offered to project participants that were not specifically funded by the project. City, state, and federal funds provided a free breakfast and lunch program to all the participants. The children had access to the services of the school nurse, the district social worker, and a family worker. The social worker provided counseling to many of the parents regarding their child's education. The family worker made home visits to parents if a problem was identified, and served as a resource for referrals to other agencies.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Teacher observations and standardized inventories were the assessment instruments used to evaluate participant progress. Two standardized inventories were administered on a pre- and post-test basis. These were the:

- Basic Inventory of Natural Languages (BINL) that measures oral language skills. This is a complete language assessment system designed to measure language dominance, proficiency, and growth in English.
- Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS) that measure the expressive and receptive language abilities of children in English.

The pre-test was administered to all children at the beginning of the project year (usually October) or when the child first entered the program. The post-test was administered at the end of the project year. Children tested on both the BINL and the Pre-LAS showed statistically significant growth (p less than .05) in the first and second years of the project.

Follow-Up Evaluations

All children entering kindergarten are pretested with the English version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). This test was developed by the NYC Board of Education to measure the English language proficiency of non-native speakers of English. Test results are used to determine whether a child's level of English proficiency is sufficient to enable that child to participate effectively in classes taught in English. It measures listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills. If the child scores above the 20th percentile on the pre-test, that child can be mainstreamed into regular English-dominant kindergarten classes and can receive supplementary remedial services. Children who score below the 21st percentile are provided with bilingual/ESL instruction.

In both 1987-88 and 1988-89, all of the Greek-speaking children were placed in the bilingual Greek kindergarten. These classes also included non-LEP children and are considered enrichment classes, not remedial classes. Bilingual kindergartens were not available for Spanish-speaking children. In both 1987-88 and 1988-89, three-fourths of the Hispanic participants were placed in the ESL kindergarten. The remaining children were mainstreamed.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

The project staff consisted of one half-time teacher trainer; two full-time bilingual teachers--one Greek, one Spanish; and two full-time paraprofessionals--one Greek, one Spanish. The paraprofessionals served primarily as teaching assistants. They worked in small groups with the children, served lunches, helped set up classrooms, cleaned up classrooms, and contacted parents. A brief description of the staff characteristics and qualifications follows:

- Greek Teacher: Certified in Bilingual Education; Common Branch License (K-8); 10 years experience in early childhood education in District 30.
- Spanish Teacher: Certified in Bilingual Education; Early Childhood Education License; one year of experience in a Montessori preschool.
- Greek Paraprofessional: High school diploma, 30 college credits, resides in the community, previous early childhood experience.
- Spanish Paraprofessional: High school diploma, 80 college credits, resides in the community, previous early childhood experience.

There was little staff turnover. The teachers remained with the project over the course of the three years. In the last year of the project, the Spanish paraprofessional left and was replaced by another bilingual paraprofessional who had had three years previous experience working with this age group.

Parents and grandparents served as volunteers in the project. They helped serve lunches, made costumes for class activities, and provided other support as needed.

Training

Training for the teachers and paraprofessionals in the project was facilitated by the services of the supervisor of bilingual education, the ESL coordinator, the early childhood education coordinator funded through the district, and the teacher-trainer position funded through this project. Staff development workshops were held on Friday mornings, when children did not attend school. The teacher trainer coordinated these workshops.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thirteen in-service training sessions were offered to District 30 bilingual staff during the 1988-89 school year. Topics included:

- A Multicultural Approach to Early Childhood Education;
- Human Values in Prekindergarten;
- Using Filmstrips to Develop Oral Language;
- Observing Young Children;
- T.V's Power to Teach;
- Sharing Holiday Projects and Ideas;
- How Infants Imitate;
- Child Abuse/Neglect;
- Three Years of Prekindergarten. What's Been Accomplished? What More Can We Do?;
- How Children Use Stories to Construct Their Cognitive World;
- A Research Base for a Prekindergarten Literacy Program;
- Multicultural Education -- Celebrating Our Differences; and
- Educating Parents Through the Use of Video.

In addition to the in-service training, district teachers took courses in local colleges and universities related to teaching through bilingual and ESL methods and materials. These courses were funded from the district's Title VII funds. The Spanish-speaking teacher in this project took education credits at St. Johns College. Information on the specific courses taken by project staff were not reported in the evaluation.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

The District 30 project had a very strong parent component. Parents participated in a variety of activities during the 1988-89 school year, including adult education/ESL classes, parent workshops, special events, and classroom activities. Parents were informed about school activities through memos in their native language.

ESL classes. One hour ESL classes were held once a week at each school from 9:00a.m. to 10:30a.m. for parents of the project participants. Twenty sessions were offered by the bilingual teacher trainer at each school. Children in the morning session remained in their classroom while their parents received instruction. Most of the children from the afternoon session remained at home with babysitters while their parents attended class. On occasion, one or two children attended class with their parents. Registration varied among schools, with 17 parents registering at P.S. 70 and 19 parents registering at P.S. 76. However, these included other parents in addition to those whose children participated in the project. Average attendance in the sessions was 80 percent for P.S. 70 and 75 percent for P.S. 76. Results of pre- and post-tests administered in October and May, respectively, showed that all participants made statistically significant gains at the .01 level.

Parent workshops. Parents attended training workshops on Friday afternoon, when classes were not held for children. The classes were conducted by the teacher trainer, the bilingual teachers, and volunteer consultants. Here teachers acquainted parents with pupils' progress and trained them in ways to help their children at home.

Most parents came without their children, however, those children that did come were looked after by the paraprofessional in the room. In order to accommodate parents who could not attend the Friday workshops, informational workshops were held at the end of the ESL classes on Tuesday and Thursday for project parents only. These were conducted by the teacher trainer.

In addition, in 1988-89 the district bilingual office organized and held nine workshops for parents at each school during school hours. Some workshops centered around ethnic heritage themes, while others focused on helping LEP pupils succeed in school through parental assistance at home and at school.

Advisory council. Parent representatives participated in an ad hoc project advisory group which also included the supervisor of bilingual education, the early childhood program coordinator, and the principals of P.S. 70 and P.S. 76. The group met, as necessary, to discuss issues that were not requirements set by the NYC Board of Education. For example, the group chose topics for the parent workshops.

Parent-teacher interaction. Frequent communication was common between parents and teachers in this project. Good rapport was established because the teachers could speak the language of the parents. They often helped parents with problems at home and served as resources for the parents. The parents, in turn, participated in field trips, volunteered in the classrooms, made costumes for special assemblies, and participated in ethnic festivals. In general, parents who were not working participated in school activities. In some cases, grandparents also volunteered their services.

Educational Linkages

District 30 was responsible for administering, staffing and housing this project. Supplementary as well as supportive services were supplied by district office personnel such as the district bilingual supervisor, the ESL coordinator, the early childhood coordinator, a family worker, who was associated with other prekindergarten projects, and a social worker.

All the facilities of the school were available to project participants. The classes were fully integrated into the school environment with children participating in various school programs such as assemblies, gym, et cetera. Project staff were directly supervised by the principal at each school, and attended in-service workshops with other bilingual school staff.

Fiscal Operations

Project Budget

The project budget for 1989-90 was $195,000. The line items included the following:

Item	Amount
Personnel services	$117,758
Fringe benefits	39,248
Instructional supplies	13,988
Travel and conferences	800
Evaluation	7,000
Postage	300
Tuition	4,500
Indirect costs	11,413
TOTAL	**$195,000**

Future Project Capacity

The District 30 project ended in June 1990, when federal funding terminated. Children who would be eligible for this project are currently served in the district's other prekindergarten classes. LEP children at P.S. 76 are enrolled in the prekindergarten program at that school. The district is trying to hire a Spanish-speaking paraprofessional for these children. At P.S. 70, because of overcrowding, there are currently no prekindergarten classes. The LEP children at that school must go to another school for any services.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Two key elements that were most important to this project's success were the teachers and the small class sizes. Teachers were committed to the project and worked to make it succeed. By developing good rapport with parents, they were able to integrate them into the learning process. The teachers demonstrated expertise and knowledge in teaching LEP children.

The small group size of each of the classes (under 15 children) allowed for individualized attention. Parent volunteers worked in the classroom along with the teacher and paraprofessional. These close working relationships facilitated socialization and made the children feel more comfortable.

Major Challenges

The major concern of the project staff was that there were too many requirements for testing children. Teachers felt the testing was very time consuming and that results were not conclusive. Their notion is that test results are affected by the mood of the child the day the test is administered.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The major recommendation for subsequent projects was the inclusion of non-LEP children. The project director believes that if approximately 30 to 40 percent of the participants were non-LEP, they could provide a peer support group and facilitate LEP children's learning the English language.

*CELEBRATIONS! Special Population Program for Preschool Children
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

*CELEBRATIONS! Educational Services, Inc., is a bilingual preschool serving three-, four- and five-year-old children in the predominantly low-income and Hispanic neighborhoods of southeastern Oklahoma City. *CELEBRATIONS! is the first and only bilingual preschool in Oklahoma City and is housed in the basement of a local community center. The Title VII-funded program is an expansion of the preschool program established in 1975 and was developed to meet the needs of low-income LEP Hispanics who live in economically depressed neighborhoods. It is designed to be a two-year program, with children typically entering at age four.

All children in the program are from low-income families and most are limited English proficient. The vast majority of participants are Mexicans, while the remaining Hispanic groups served are Colombian, Nicaraguan, and Venezuelan. The project also serves a handful of white, Vietnamese, Pakistani, Native American, and Hindu children.

Program Philosophy

The project framework is based on research in early childhood education, previous program experiences, and philosophies of preschool personnel. Program developers believe that "children learn as a result from the interaction between thinking and encountering experiences in the real world." The emphasis on early intervention and development of school readiness in economically deprived children is expressed in a quote from Erikson, used in the project proposal: "Many a child's development is disrupted when family life has failed to prepare him for school life."

Project Goals

The primary educational goals stated by *CELEBRATIONS! were to: (1) develop a strong foundation in the English language; (2) improve intellectual skills; (3) acquire self-motivation and a positive attitude; and (4) develop societal arts and skills. A major objective for staff was to provide certified training opportunities and continuing education for bilingual specialists and teacher aides.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

The project utilizes a variety of methods to recruit children. These methods include:

- Posting flyers in local neighborhoods;
- Word of mouth through former children and their families;
- Door-to-door canvassing of neighborhoods each August;

- Referrals from the Oklahoma City Public Schools, other area public and private schools, the local Catholic church, social service agencies, and other area organizations; and

- Advertisements in the local newspaper and telephone book.

While the program is open to all pre-kindergarten children in the city, children who are chosen to participate in the *CELEBRATIONS! program generally are enrolled based on three criteria: they are residents of the Eugene Fields and Capitol Hill neighborhoods in Oklahoma City; are limited English proficient or from homes where English is not the native language; and live in homes with low-income families.

The project director indicated that *CELEBRATIONS! had little difficulty recruiting children because city residents were already familiar with the program before the Title VII grant was received. Children who cannot be served are placed on a waiting list and their parents are contacted when there is an opening.

Enrollment

The initial goals for enrollment were for 40 children each year. The city fire and health code regulations set a limit of 32 children in the community center basement, but the project enrolled 40 because of the high rate of absenteeism. The actual number of children enrolled during the three-year funding period was higher than proposed because the grant enabled the project to offer two daily sessions and thus serve more children. The unduplicated total of children served for the three program years is as follows:

1987-88: 62 (52 LEP)
1988-89: 72 (68 LEP)
1989-90: 82 (77 LEP)

Retention

The program has experienced high absenteeism and fairly high noncompletion rates over the years. Twenty-four participants (29 percent) left the program prior to completion during 1989-90. The project director attributes about three-fourths of this to the fact that families moved out of the city or to points in the city that were too far away for the *CELEBRATIONS! van to pick them up. A handful of parents pulled their children out because they wanted them to wait until they were old enough to attend kindergarten.

*CELEBRATIONS! offers several services that help to minimize these factors and meet children's and parents' needs. These include a van that brings children to and from the center, home visits by teachers, frequent telephone calls to parents, provision of breakfast and lunch each day for the children, and referrals to social service and other community agencies.

Schedules

During the first two years of the project, two sessions were offered. Each session was three hours long--8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and noon to 3:00p.m. The program expanded to an extended-day format during the third year of the project, lasting for five and a half hours, from 8:30a.m. to 2:00p.m. The decision to expand program hours was based on literature demonstrating that children in extended-day preschool and kindergarten programs show increased "school readiness." The expansion was also initiated in response to working parents' requests.

Instructional Strategies

Curriculum. During the first two program years, teaching and curriculum followed the Montessori method, which is based on children's self-responsibility, freedom of choice, and an ordered and planned environment. However, the project switched to the High/Scope curriculum because administrators felt it was better accepted in the early childhood arena, easier to use, and more easily understood by teachers. The project also found it more difficult to find teachers trained in the Montessori method.

The High/Scope curriculum, which is based on Piaget's developmental theory, emphasizes language development through a bicultural and natural approach and allows children to learn in all development areas--including physical, social, emotional, and intellectual--while enabling children to develop a positive self-concept and positive feelings about learning. The curriculum emphasizes the teacher's role as a facilitator and emphasizes children's exposure to concrete, hands-on experiences.

Instructional organization. Based on this curriculum model, *CELEBRATIONS! runs a tight schedule of closely supervised activities and organizes the classroom into clearly defined work areas such as home living, blocks, creative art, quiet area, music and movement, and sand and water, in addition to the Montessori-based areas of practical life, sensorial, language, and math. The program recently added a new library and language area with all new materials and reorganized space to accommodate additional learning centers to expand writing and reading readiness skills. Language development in English and Spanish is integrated into all of the areas.

Daily activities typically follow a "theme" of the week or month, integrated into meals, group discussion and play, individually paced directed activities, and outdoor play. Teachers give individualized attention to each child during outdoor play and learning center time. Children also participate in regular field trips. The following is a detailed daily schedule from the 1989-90 program:

8:30a.m. - 8:50a.m.	Breakfast
8:50a.m. - 9:15a.m.	Planning time
9:15a.m. - 10:15a.m.	Self-selected and self-directed time, with teacher supervision
10:15a.m. - 10:30a.m.	Recall time
10:30a.m. - 11:00a.m.	Recess/outdoor play/movement exercises
11:00a.m. - 11:30a.m.	Lunch
11:30a.m. - 12:00p.m.	Story time
12:00p.m. - 12:35p.m.	Movement education (songs, gymnastics, dancing)

12:35p.m. - 1:10p.m.	Language development
1:10p.m. - 1:45p.m.	Language development (more songs, stories, English language practice)
1:45p.m. - 1:50p.m.	Snack
1:50p.m. - 2:00p.m.	Prepare to go home

Grouping. Children generally are grouped according to age rather than language proficiency, especially in large-group activities. Whether the teacher uses English or the native language depends on what the children understand. Typically, teachers speak in Spanish so that the children will understand concepts, then they move to English.

Materials and Equipment

Teachers make use of videotapes, story books, records, and tapes; game trays, plastic counters, play dough, puzzles, and toys; and art supplies such as construction paper, crayons, paint, glue, and yarn. Each child is responsible for selecting materials and returning them to their proper place.

Non-Instructional Services

Through fund raising efforts, *CELEBRATIONS! is able to provide and fund several non-instructional services for project participants. The primary services include a van that brings children to and from school each day; daily serving of breakfast and lunch; and referrals to social services and community agencies. Because of the program's longstanding and highly regarded reputation in the community, parents often turn to staff for advice and assistance in times of family crisis. All children also receive developmental, health, visual, and auditory screenings by professionals who volunteer their time.

Participant Evaluation

Placement/Entry

Upon enrollment in the program, all children were tested to determine their level of English language proficiency. Assessment instruments included:

- Home Language Survey of parents;
- Observations by the project director and bilingual specialists during initial interview with the parent and child;
- Observations made during initial and follow-up home visits; and
- The standardized language assessment instrument, called Pre-LAS (English version).

The majority of children had no ability to understand or speak English when they entered the program. By the time they ended the program, most could understand and speak English fairly well but were not fluent.

Children were also given a pre-test in learning styles so that teachers could decide whether a child would be better served by focusing on visual or active/motor activities.

Participant Progress

Pre- and post-test gains on the Pre-LAS were the primary means for assessing child progress in English language acquisition. Pre-LAS scores showed gains each year in all objective areas (e.g., acquisition of oral English). In the 1989-90 program year, children with pre- and post-test scores averaged almost 37-point raw score gains on the Pre-LAS--eight points more than the previous year's children.

Staff also observed progress in children in that they exhibited greater ability to follow directions, participate in group activities, eat properly, and dress themselves.

Follow-up Evaluations

An independent evaluator is tracking the educational progress of former *CELEBRATIONS! children who have entered kindergarten. A preliminary finding is that the children who have attended *CELEBRATIONS! are less likely to drop out than are children who have not attended. This information is hard to track, however, because families in Oklahoma City move frequently.

The evaluation is also comparing other LEP kindergarten children with a sample of *CELEBRATIONS! alumni through test scores on the Brigance Battery of Kindergarten Readiness and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. While *CELEBRATIONS! children, on average, have scored in the "at risk" range, their scores are about the same as other LEP kindergarten children on the Brigance readiness test and significantly higher on all of the Iowa Tests.

In 1987-88, 97 percent of LEP children from *CELEBRATIONS! were mainstreamed into kindergarten classes. Ninety-eight percent of children were mainstreamed in 1988-89, and all children were mainstreamed in 1989-90. The tiny percentage of children who were not mainstreamed were enrolled in the extended-day bilingual programs, in part, because of child care preferences of some working parents.

Staff

Qualifications

The project staff consisted of a full-time project director, three part-time bilingual preschool specialists who served as teachers (the third specialist was added in the third year of the project), and one teacher aide. Some volunteers were used to read to children and attend field trips, but their attendance was not steady. Three of the professional and paraprofessional staff are Hispanic and two are white--the specialists and aide are all native English speakers. The qualifications and experience of the staff are as follows: two of the preschool specialists have master's degrees in education and two have bachelor's degrees (in education and psychology); one teacher received a Child Development Association credential; and all of the teaching staff have more than five years of experience in early childhood education.

The project director indicated that staff turnover in the project has been high in recent years. She has had difficulty in attracting qualified teachers but has attempted to recruit staff through newspaper ads and networking with the public schools and local community. The lure of better pay and benefits in the public schools has led many possible candidates to kindergarten or elementary grades. Also, some teachers have moved when their husbands obtained job transfers.

Training

During the 1989-90 school year, teachers and other staff had access to approximately 30 in-service training sessions, conferences, college courses, and workshops. The project director is working toward completing a master's degree and certification in bilingual training for preschool children and attended additional training sessions and degree credentialling courses. Training sessions attended by teachers encompassed a wide variety of topics including: assessment of children, classroom, and time management, High/Scope curriculum, learning styles, manipulation of materials, movement and music, working with parents, bilingual program models and design, and children's play. Staff development was funded by the Title VII grant and was provided by nearby universities such as Central State University and the University of Oklahoma.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

Because *CELEBRATIONS! views the child within the family context, parental involvement is promoted through the Parent Involvement Program, including mandatory attendance at monthly meetings, parent workshops, monthly classroom activities, occasional field trips, and parent-teacher conferences. At monthly meetings, guest speakers are often invited to talk on various topics, such as parenting skills, nutrition, parents' rights, holidays, drug abuse prevention, and home instructional activities.

Approximately 80 percent of parents attended the workshops, while about half of parents attended classroom activities once a month or chaperoned occasional field trips. Home instructional activities were encouraged, but it was difficult for project staff to determine parents' level of involvement outside the classroom.

In the 1989-90 school year, *CELEBRATIONS! began an ongoing weekly parent training program called "Los Niños Bien Educados" ("The Well-Educated Children"). From November 1989 through March 1990, 22 parents met for three hours once a week for 14 weeks. During an 11-week session in the spring, 14 parents attended. The project director feels this program has been very successful. She has noticed lifestyle improvements in parents, as evidenced in their holding jobs longer and exhibiting better family relationships and awareness of their children's needs.

Educational Linkages

The project director indicates that *CELEBRATIONS! has established good communications and relations with local public school teachers and principals, particularly in facilitating the mainstreaming of preschool children into kindergarten. The public school system does not provide any equipment, facilities, or staff.

The project's Advisory Board consists of an educational consultant, speech therapist, administrative consultant, and a public accountant. The president, treasurer, and secretary from the *CELEBRATIONS! Board of Directors all serve on the Advisory Board. Their primary contribution has been to plan and execute fund raising efforts and to work as liaisons with community organizations.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

The *CELEBRATIONS! project was funded through a variety of sources during its three-year federal grant. The budget breakdown for FY 1990 was as follows:

- Special Populations Grant - $57,919 (about 30 percent);
- Department of Mental Health (state grant for parenting classes) - $25,000 (about 15 percent);
- Grants from private organizations (e.g., Lion's Club, Junior Hospitality, and other fund raisers) - about $35,000 (20 percent);
- Individual contributions - about $35,000 (20 percent; these vary from year to year);
- Child fees - $12,000 (about 7 percent); and
- Funds from United Way - $13,065 (about 8 percent).

In-kind contributions included clothing and toys provided by the Board of Directors, free tax help from an accounting firm, and free medical services from a local physician.

Future Project Capacity

Even though the Title VII grant terminated in summer 1990, the project continues to operate. With nearly a third of its income gone, it has compensated by scaling back its program to serve about 40 children and by seeking additional funding from grants and private donations. Funds will be raised through individuals and by groups such as the United Methodist Church, Southwestern Bell, the City Community Foundation, and the Lion's Club. Fund-raising events such as auctions and food booths have also been utilized.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

The most important factor contributing to the project's success was the additional funding provided through the Special Populations grant. The grant allowed the project to purchase educational materials, expand the program to serve more children, send teachers to college classes, and hire an evaluator. Other key factors included good staff training, parental involvement, and assistance from the Board of Directors in the way of fund-raising efforts and advocacy for the children.

Major Challenges

Major challenges faced by the *CELEBRATIONS! Title VII project were:

- Finding good, professional, bilingual staff;
- Encouraging parents to come into the classroom (staff sometimes worked nights and weekends to accommodate parents' schedules); and
- Low pay--despite low salaries, staff continued to work on the project because they enjoyed it.

Recommendations for Future Projects

The project director noted three essential components necessary for other projects implementing bilingual preschool projects:

- Competent, professional bilingual staff;
- Parental involvement--some children cannot succeed because their parents do not help them or understand the importance of education for very young children; and
- A dedicated Board of Directors and staff who will work long hours and will involve themselves in the community.

Highline Public Schools ESL Preschool Project
Seattle, Washington

The Highline Public Schools ESL Preschool Project was a three-year preschool serving predominately Asian limited English proficient (LEP) four- and five-year-olds at a district elementary school. The majority were Cambodian and Vietnamese. Ninety-eight percent of the children's families were at or below the poverty level.

Program Philosophy

This program was originally based on the ALERTA model developed by Head Start. The program differs some from the ALERTA model: ALERTA enrolls monolingual English speakers and non-English speakers who speak the same language, while the Highline project enrolls LEP children with different native languages. Two strands of research guide the program: using appropriate preschool practices in general, and incorporating native languages and cultures in the program.

Project Goals

The project goals were directed to children and their parents.

Children:	To accelerate mainstreaming of children;
	To promote concept development through use of the native language;
	To encourage social adjustment; and
	To develop school readiness skills.
Parents:	To promote parental participation in the project.

Project Operation and Services

Recruitment

Potential participants were informed of the project primarily through personal referrals. Bilingual tutors discussed the project in the LEP communities and posted fliers in mainly LEP housing projects. In addition, information was given to older siblings enrolled in the K-12 bilingual program, social workers, area high schools, and the district's special education program. Although a waiting list was kept for potential participants, interest did not exceed available space.

Enrollment

The ESL Preschool Project proposed to serve 40 children each year; the actual number of children served was lower to provide classes of an appropriate size for preschool. In addition, lack of transportation for the first two years forced some children to leave the program and might have dissuaded others from initially enrolling. Initial enrollment was similar for all three years: 30 children in 1987-88; 30 children in 1988-89; and 29 children in 1989-90.

Retention

Five to nine children who enrolled in the program left without completing the year for a variety of reasons. In most cases, the family moved out of the district, or became unable to provide transportation to school for the child. Illness was a minor impediment to participation. The project attempted to retain children by arranging car pools in the first two years and a bus in the last year of the project. In addition, staff called and visited parents of participants with attendance problems.

Schedules

The project operated two discrete sessions--in the morning from 9:00a.m. to 11:30a.m. and afternoon from 12:30p.m. to 3:00p.m.--36 weeks each year. For the first year of operation, children attended five days per week. For the last two years, every other Monday was reserved as a staff work day.

Instructional Strategies

Instructional methodologies were based on the concept that second language is best learned in the context of other learning activities that are relevant to the child, concrete, and non-threatening. Most instructional activities occurred individually in learning centers or collectively with the entire class.

Learning centers. Children spent about one-fourth of the day in learning centers. The following learning centers were set up:

- The housekeeping center;
- The block center;
- The sand and water center;
- The art center;
- The table top manipulatives and games center;
- The library;
- The large muscle area;
- The woodworking center; and
- The science center.

Grouping. Because the program philosophy prohibits tracking, children were generally not divided into groups by the teacher. The only exception was when a particularly difficult subject was being taught; in that case, children were separated by and taught in their native language. Instruction involving the entire class was in English; bilingual aides translated on an individual basis.

Curriculum. The overall curriculum was based on the ALERTA model. Within that framework, progressively broader themes marked the curriculum: the child, the family, the world, et cetera. Themes emphasized cultural diversity.

Materials and Equipment

All chairs, desks, and other equipment, including a stove, were provided by the school district. Materials for learning centers were chosen to:

- Develop fine and gross motor coordination;
- Encourage an understanding of cause-effect and means-end relationships; and
- Develop concepts such as association, numbers, size discrimination, et cetera.

Non-Instructional Services

A number of non-instructional services, financed by the district, were offered to participants in the ESL Preschool Program. The school nurse and dental hygienist provided check-ups for all of the children. The school professional staff, including the nurse, dental hygienist, and psychologist, were available and the district provided referral services for needs beyond the scope of the schools. The district provided limited transportation for the first two years, and a preschool bus for the final year of the project.

Participant Evaluation

Participant Progress

Participant progress was measured by systematic teacher observation and standardized inventories. The inventories include:

- Preschool Language Assessment Scales (Pre-LAS), which measure the expressive and receptive abilities of children in English, and

- Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT), which evaluates school readiness skills in language and mathematics.

The Pre-LAS was administered when the child entered the program and again at the conclusion of the program. The MRT was given only at the conclusion of the program. In 1988-89, children gained an average of 1.5 points on the 5-point Pre-LAS, with a post-test mean of 2.4. A score of 2 is a non-English speaker; a score of 3 is a limited English speaker. MRT scores were not available.

Follow-Up Evaluations

After leaving the ESL Preschool Program, children entered either a mainstreamed kindergarten or an ESL kindergarten. The original proposal described a third option, mainstreaming with ESL assistance, but no children qualified for that. In the second year of the project, for which data are available, 19 percent of the participants passed the exit criteria--scores above three on the Pre-LAS and 83 percent on the MRT--and were placed in the mainstreamed kindergarten. The percentage passing is significantly higher than the five percent defined as the project's goal. Children who had completed the ESL Preschool Program and participated in the district kindergarten were subsequently tracked closely with MRT retests, teacher evaluation forms, and exit rates, though these data were not available when we talked with the project.

Staff

Qualifications and Roles

In the third year of the project, the staff consisted of a project coordinator, one full-time teacher, two full-time paraprofessionals, and one part-time paraprofessional. The paraprofessionals assisted the teachers by instructing classes, leading small groups, conducting parent meetings and home visits, and developing materials. The part-time paraprofessional position was developed in the third year; for the first two years, the part-time position was for a clerk. A brief description of the classroom staff characteristics and qualifications follows:

- Teacher: Certified in Special Education and English as a Second Language; 10 years early childhood teaching experience.
- Full-time Paraprofessional: Native speaker of Vietnamese and Chinese; two and one half years of teaching experience.
- Full-time Paraprofessional: Native speaker of Cambodian and Vietnamese; two years of teaching experience in Vietnam.
- Part-time Paraprofessional: Native speaker of Cambodian.

There was little staff turnover. The teacher remained with the project for the duration; two aides left, one for a better paying position.

Parents, other school children, and community members volunteered to help with the project. Parents primarily cooked for the class and chaperoned field trips. Fifth grade students visited the preschool and read to the participants. Community members videotaped preschool activities for the benefit of the children.

Training

Training for the teacher and paraprofessionals was provided by the LEA and consultants and funded mainly by Title VII and partly by the school district. Most training occurred in staff meetings for the teacher; the most influential training for the paraprofessionals occurred through evaluations of their classroom practices.

Topics of in-service training sessions include:

- ALERTA philosophy;
- Early childhood developmental practices;
- Second language development;
- Testing;
- Student management;
- Parental involvement;
- Observation skills;
- Multicultural education; and
- School district functioning.

Project Linkages

Parental Linkages

The ESL Preschool Project actively involved parents, especially in the last year. In the third year of the project, the Citizens Education Center Northwest developed and trained staff to use a model for involving low socio-economic status parents in the program. Parent participation in all three years centered around meetings and home visits. The most significant result of parental involvement was the change in perceptions of the parents' role in education. Parents learned to see themselves as facilitators of their children's education and continued to function as such even after their children had left the program.

Parent meetings. Parent meetings were held eight times in the last year. Child care was provided to enable parents to attend: average attendance was 90 percent. In those meetings, parents learned about activities conducted in the classroom and how to develop instructional activities at home.

Advisory council. Although there was not an official advisory council, the group of parents who attended meetings functioned as an advisory group. This group offered suggestions and criticism to improve the operation of the project.

Parent-teacher interaction. The teacher or paraprofessionals visited approximately 90 percent of the parents at home two times in the last year of the project's operation. Parents, in turn, volunteered to chaperon field trips.

Educational Linkages

The ESL Preschool director was the district director of all bilingual programs, so consistency of oversight of participants was maintained. After each child graduated from the preschool, records on the child were given to the appropriate kindergarten teacher; later in the year preschool teachers visited the kindergarten class to observe the child and hold a progress conference with the kindergarten teacher.

The ESL Preschool Project was housed in an elementary school and received the space and all regular school services free of cost. Services included: professional assistance by the school psychologist, dental hygienist, and nurse; supportive services of the custodians and secretaries; special services and testing for handicapped children; use of the library and science kit center; transportation; equipment; and heat and air conditioning. Teachers were included in school in-service training.

Fiscal Operations

Project Costs

Aside from the in-kind contributions listed above, all aspects of the project were financed by the Title VII Special Populations grant.

Future Project Capacity

The ESL Preschool Project ended in the spring of 1990, when federal funding terminated. In the fall of 1990, a state-funded, bilingual Head Start program began to serve the population previously using the Special Populations program. This program employs one monolingual teacher and one aide, operates for a half-day session, and serves 18 children.

Conclusion

Key Elements of Success

Four elements were instrumental in ensuring the success of this project: the quality of the staff, the use of the native language to develop concepts, the location in a public school, and the appropriateness of the design to meet the needs of the children. The teacher and aides were well qualified and had made long-term commitments to the project, facilitating continuity of child instruction and staff training. The children were able to learn age-appropriate concepts because content development did not hinge on English fluency. The location of the project in a public school eased the transition to kindergarten, and the school provided in-kind services otherwise financially unavailable to the project. Finally, the project was successful because it was designed to meet the needs of four- to five-year-olds rather than adapted from a less appropriate model.

Recommendations for Future Projects

Recommendations for a beginning bilingual preschool were to plan for social services and to employ staff who value different cultural backgrounds. The bilingual coordinator feels that services must extend beyond the classroom (i.e., welfare counseling) for a LEP program to be successful. She also noted that monocultural prejudices in staff can destroy an otherwise perfect program.

Many suggestions emanating from this project are appropriate for all good preschool projects: develop parent involvement at the onset of the project; keep good records; deliberately develop a strong link with the local school district; do not overtest; and plan regular, paid staff time for meetings and planning.

THE TITLE VII SPECIAL POPULATIONS PRESCHOOL PROGRAM IN THE CONTEXT OF OTHER FEDERAL EFFORTS

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION

1993

Renee Sherman
Lorelei Brush
Rebecca Herman

SPECIAL POPULATIONS PRESCHOOL PROGRAM: A PREPARATORY PROGRAM FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN

INTRODUCTION

Federal involvement with bilingual education formally began in 1968 with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act, an amendment to Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provides for "early childhood education programs and is designed to improve the potential for profitable learning activities by children." In 1974, the Bilingual Education Act was amended to authorize "activities at the preschool level." This intent was reaffirmed in 1984, when Title VII of the Educational Amendments of 1984 explicitly provided financial assistance to local education agencies; institutions of higher education, including junior or community colleges; and private nonprofit organizations to establish Special Populations Programs that would be preparatory or supplementary to the programs assisted under the act. Special Population Programs are defined as programs for preschool, special education, and gifted and talented children. Special Populations Programs may also be supplemental or preparatory to bilingual programs funded at the local level. Following the enactment of the legislation, the Department of Education (ED) began providing assistance to preschool, special education, and gifted and talented projects serving LEP children.

This paper is concerned with the Special Populations Preschool Program. It presents various aspects of the Program including the intent of the legislation enacting the Program, a summary of Pelavin Associates' review of the preschool projects funded under the Program, and the relationship between the Special Populations Preschool Program and Head Start and Even Start. Based on the findings of the above research activities, the final section of the paper presents a set of policy recommendations for future Special Populations Preschool Programs.

Legislative Intent of the Special Populations Preschool Program

The Education Amendments of 1984, Title VII

Before examining the intent of the Special Populations Preschool Programs, it is important to understand the general intent of the Bilingual Education Act. The intent of the 1984 legislation was to "establish equal educational opportunity for all children and to promote educational excellence (A) to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational programs using bilingual educational practices, techniques, and methods; (B) to encourage the establishment of special alternative instructional programs for students of limited English proficiency in school districts where the establishment of bilingual education programs is not practicable or for other appropriate reasons; and (C) for those purposes, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies. The programs under this title are designed to meet the needs of the LEP population with particular attention to children having the greatest need for such programs. They are designed to enable students to achieve full competence in English, and in addition may provide for the development of student competence in a second language. In accordance with the stipulation of the 1974 Amendments to the Bilingual Education Act, a goal of Title VII funding was to build the capacity of the local school districts to continue operating bilingual education programs after seed funding was discontinued.

The instructional program chosen by a school district depends on a number of variables including the characteristics of the LEP population, the philosophy of the program, the availability of qualified staff, etc. Similarly, the nature of the preschool program is dependent on these same variables. In addition, the legislation enacting the program, and the regulations implementing it provide for a wide range of flexibility.

Intent of Special Populations Preschool Program

Legislative History

It is much more difficult to determine the specific intent of the Special Populations Preschool Program. To do so, we traced the legislative history of the Education Amendments of 1984, Title VII (Revision of the Bilingual Education Act), Section 721 (a) (6), which provided the first explicit reference in law to the bilingual preschool program; "Funds available for grants under this part shall be used for the establishment, operation, and improvement of...bilingual preschool...programs,". We found, however, that this research shed no light on the intent of the legislation, although we did find where it originated. The provision for bilingual preschools emerged from a House Bill (H.R. 5231) in the form of an amendment to another House Bill (H.R.11) while H.R. 11 was in debate in the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education. H.R. 11 proposed reauthorization for 10 educational programs due to expire, including Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act. H.R. 5231, introduced March 22, 1984 proposed reauthorization of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the bilingual education section. The bill recommended a number of substantive changes including specific reference to funding bilingual preschool programs. When H.R. 11 was sent to the full committee, it included an amendment based on H.R. 5231 calling for a new category of grants to serve LEP children through bilingual preschool and other programs. There was, however, no mention of the bilingual preschool program in the debate or the testimony before the Subcommittee hearings.

On the Senate side, the bill before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (S. 2496) was for the reauthorization of aid to adult education. A conference committee worked on a compromise between the House and Senate bills. Essentially, the Senate bill was amended to include most of the text of H.R. 11, including the provision of grants for bilingual preschools. There was, again, no mention of the bilingual preschool programs during the hearings.

Capacity Building

The intent of the program, as gleaned from conversations with ED officials, is two-fold: to provide continuity between pre-kindergarten and kindergarten and to incorporate the program into the school's regular instructional plan. As stated in the 1974 Amendments, Title VII programs are intended to build the capacity of the local school districts to serve the LEP population. This intention is also evidenced in the selection criteria defined in the regulations implementing the Special Populations Program. The regulations require applicants to describe their "commitment and capacity to continue, expand, and build upon the project when Federal assistance ends". According to ED officials, the intention is for the programs to incorporate what they have learned within the school system and use other monies to continue funding key aspects or components of the program. There was no designation that the Special Populations Preschool Programs was intended to develop "model programs" nor was money allocated for dissemination of a program model.

The level at which a program is authorized and its subsequent appropriations can generally provide insight into whether the program was intended to be a service program. However, with the Special Populations Program, there is no specific authorization from Congress. The only legislative requirement is that 60 percent of the funds appropriated for bilingual education under Title VII must be allocated to Part A programs, which include Special Populations. The Department of Education requests funds for Special Populations Programs. Requests have ranged from $2,500,000 in 1986[1] to $6,900,000 in 1991. The appropriations for

---

[1] Fiscal Year 1985 funds were requested prior to enactment of the 1984 Amendments.

Special Populations have ranged from $3,500,000 in 1985 to $6,944,000 in 1991. These funds support all Special Populations Programs, including the Special Populations Preschool Program.

Conversations with ED officials involved with developing the regulations and who are currently implementing the program have indicated that these funding levels are insufficient to meet the needs of all preschool age LEP children requiring services. Therefore, although the program has some characteristics of a service program--it is national in scope and grantees have the discretion of determining how funds will be spent to meet the needs of the LEP preschool population--because of its limited funding ED officials do not regard the program as a broad based service program.

ED officials regard the program as a demonstration program despite the fact that it lacks certain characteristics associated with traditional demonstration programs. Neither the legislation nor the implementing regulations require the development of a model or provision of any evidence of replicability. Nor is there any requirement for a national evaluation of the program. Capacity building is the only language in the legislation or in the regulations that defines the intent of the Special Populations Programs.

Summary of Review of Special Populations Preschool Program

In the fall of 1990, Pelavin Associates, Inc. conducted a descriptive evaluation of projects funded under the Special Populations Preschool Program for the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. Primarily, we were asked to describe the characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of a subset of preschool projects funded by the Program in Fiscal Year 1990. The examination of these preschool projects was particularly appropriate at this time because President Bush and the nation's Governors had recently set a goal for the year 2000 that all children enter school ready to learn. Preschool programs that prepare children for entry into elementary schools were an appropriate target for study if this goal is to be met. Preschool programs for LEP children forward this goal by helping these children gain a sufficient command of English to succeed in elementary school. In addition, the review addressed ED's concern with issues of coordinating preschool services across Federal programs. Understanding the workings of these bilingual preschool programs help advance ED's ability to coordinate services.

In FY 1990 30 grants were awarded--12 for new projects, nine for projects continuing for their second year, and nine for projects entering their third and final year of operation under the Program. (A list of projects appears in Appendix A.) To obtain the data for this review, we conducted a combination of research activities that varied according to the number of years the project had been funded. For all projects in their first year of operation and the two second-year projects outside the continental United States, we conducted a file review. For the remaining second-year and two third-year projects, we conducted a file review and a site visit.[2] For the remaining third-year projects, we conducted a file review and a telephone interview.

We presented the findings of that review in our final report, Descriptive Evaluation of the Special Populations Preschool Program. The report included a cross-site analysis of the 15 projects that received site visits or telephone interviews, and a summary of the information collected from each of those sites. Below we present a summary of our findings. They are clustered into six specific areas: project goals and program philosophy; project operation and services; project staff; educational and community linkages; participant evaluation; and fiscal operations. We also include a brief discussion of the implications for policymakers from findings in two of these areas.

---

[2] One of these sites asked that its data not be included in the report. One of the projects reviewed was a preschool project that operated within a special education program. It could be classified as a part of either or both groups of Special Populations projects.

Findings

Program Philosophy, Project Operation and Services

The 15 projects selected for the review represented a diversity in the philosophies of bilingual education espoused and the ways in which the bilingual philosophy was incorporated into classroom procedures. Some projects emphasized learning English, some the native language, and the remainder placed equal emphasis on the two languages. Some enrolled only LEP children; others operated based on the notion that LEP children learn English more quickly when they play with children who speak only English. Some projects introduced languages into the classroom by providing instruction predominantly in the child's native language; some provided instruction predominantly in English; one used an English-to-speakers-of-other-languages approach; and one used alternate Spanish and English models--one classroom teacher spoke only Spanish and the other only English. Some worked exclusively with members of low-income families; others enrolled a range of socio-economic groups. Some worked exclusively with preschool children; others continued the program into kindergarten.

In addition to the diversity in approach to bilingual education, there was a difference in the degree to which projects were developmentally appropriate for preschool children. Those that were less appropriate offered predominantly teacher-directed activities and focused on cognitive and language skills. Those that were more appropriate allowed children to direct their own learning and progress at their own pace; the programs were concerned with the development of the "whole child", rather than only the child's intellectual/language skills.

Some services were common across projects. Every project had an active parent component in that each sponsored parent meetings and training sessions; some went further. All of the projects offered services for children above and beyond classroom activities (e.g., transportation, meals and snacks, and/or access to the housing school's nurse or health services). Families were sometimes offered counseling and social service referrals.

Project Staff

Staffing patterns, too, were similar across grantees. Every project was staffed by an administrator and a combination of teachers and aides; some added specialists. In most instances, the ethnicity of the staff matched that of the children and some, if not all, of the staff spoke the language of the children. Each project offered inservice training for staff; some also had preservice training or enrolled staff in programs leading to a credential.

Educational and Community Linkages

Each project had linkages within their communities. Projects under the auspices of a school system were inextricably connected to that system; projects under the auspices of a community agency were well linked to other community services.

Participant Evaluation

Projects also shared common outcomes for children. Participants in each project were observed to gain some skill in English. Many began the year with no knowledge of English and gained rudimentary skill. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 and 2 representing "non-English speaker" and 3 "limited English speaker", projects' average scores at the end of the year ranged from 1.8 to 3.1. However, interpretation of these test scores may be problematic at best.

Kindergarten and first-grade teachers reported project participants to be ahead of children who had not attended preschool in the wide range of cognitive, social/emotional, and motor skills needed by elementary school students. No testing of these skills was done; and no true control groups were used.

Fiscal Operations

The total dollar amount granted to the projects ranged from $57,919 to $304,421. The cost of the projects per child ranged from $619 to $8,481, depending largely on the services paid for by project funds. Seven projects operated full preschool programs, with the grants funding the gamut of services required by such a program. These were the more expensive projects. Four projects provided supplementary funding to existing preschool programs to expand their bilingual services. Three projects were existing preschool programs that used Special Populations funding to develop curricula appropriate to their populations of children and families. The final project provided training and technical assistance to several school districts' programs to enhance their knowledge of early childhood education and bilingual programming. These last eight projects were less expensive than those funding the full range of services.

Funding level seemed related to the capacity of a project to continue after the end of the three-year funding cycle. Projects that received full funding from Special Populations Preschool monies were less likely to be able to continue than those for whom funding was supplementary.

Implications

The findings in two areas (project operation and services and fiscal operations) we noted have implications for policymakers and program managers with regard to future directions for the program.

Project Operation and Services

Several findings regarding project operation and services suggested further issues. Three of these findings concerned enrollment. First, in some projects there was a relatively low percentage of LEP children enrolled (24% in one project). This limited enrollment suggested the following question:

- Should the law require that a minimum percentage of LEP children be served to ensure that the projects are for "limited English proficient" children?

Staff in a number of projects reported difficulties in recruiting LEP children. To ensure that staff have adequate recruitment plans, program managers might address the following issue:

- Should proposals be required to discuss how projects will recruit LEP children and families to ensure that the proposed enrollment figures will be met?

Second, projects funded by this grant program are not required to serve low-income families. In one project only 48 percent of the families served were low-income. This raises the following question:

- Is there an intention in the regulations to give priority to projects with a high percentage of low-income families?

Finally, three of the projects served kindergarten children in addition to preschool-aged children. In each case, project funds supplemented the kindergarten programs and did not pay for such core expenses as the salaries of the teachers. But

- Should there be restrictions on the funding of kindergarten programs? Are activities such as developing a kindergarten curriculum; paying for an aide for the kindergarten classroom; or paying for field trips, equipment, and materials for that classroom appropriate?

Additional questions resulted from the finding that only about half of the projects had developmentally appropriate programs:

- Should proposals be required to include a discussion of the curriculum and approach to be used in the implementation of the program? These could be judged in the area of developmental appropriateness.
- Should staff job descriptions and qualifications be reviewed to ensure that training in early childhood education is present? Should reviewing procedures ensure that inservice training on developmental issues will occur?

A final question in this area stemmed from the finding that all projects offered a parent component and encouraged increased involvement of parents in the education and development of their children. It may be appropriate to institute a requirement for projects to have such a component:

- Should project design be required to include a parent involvement component, ensuring that the project has realistic plans to involve parents by using them as volunteers in the classroom or on field trips, offering parent training sessions, and/ or including parents in ethnic festivals or other cultural awareness activities?

Fiscal Operations

The variation in budgeted cost per child and its potential relationship to future project capacity raised the following questions:

- Could proposal review benefit from setting a ceiling on budgeted cost per child of $5,000 to $5,500, thus encouraging projects to find additional funding (if needed) to operate a full program?
- Should projects that will use Special Populations grant funds to supplement other funding be given preference in the review process because of their greater potential for continuation after the termination of grant funding?

Relationship with Head Start and Even Start

The Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start and Even Start are each Federally funded programs designed to serve children before they reach the age when school attendance is compulsory. Head Start was authorized originally as a demonstration project in 1964 under the Economic Opportunity Act. Initially administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is currently administered by the Administration on Children, Youth and Families within the Department of Health and Human Services. Head Start services are provided through local public or private nonprofit agencies within a community. To be eligible to receive Head Start funds, agencies must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating--either directly or by other arrangements--a Head Start program. Grantees who receive funds to operate Head Start programs are authorized to subcontract with separate organizations--delegate agencies--to carry out programs. Head Start agencies are community action agencies; private, nonprofit organizations; public schools; State or local governments; religious organizations; and others including tribes.

The Even Start Program was authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, Part B of Chapter 1 of Title I (P.L. 100-297). The program is administered by ED's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Secretary of Education can make grants to local educational agencies or consortia of local education agencies to carry out the program or can make grants to states to enable them to carry out the program. If Federal appropriations exceed $50 million, state education agencies are expected to administer the grants.

The Department of Education is concerned with issues of coordinating preschool services across Federal programs. Understanding the workings of each program advances ED's ability to achieve optimal coordination and ensure that funds to such programs are not duplicative. The purpose of this section of the report is to compare the key elements of each of the programs. The areas discussed below are program goals, target populations, coordination requirements, services and activities, program costs, and evaluation requirements. Exhibit I provides a brief overview of these programs.

Program Goals

The Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start and Even Start share one primary goal--to enhance the preschool child's ability to succeed in school once the child reaches the age of compulsory school attendance. While the basic goals are the same, the scope and focus of the programs differ. The Special Populations Preschool Program is more limited in scope, as its primary objective is to provide educational services to facilitate the LEP children's transition into the English-speaking environment of the elementary school. The focus of the program is on the child's introduction to and facility with the English language. The legislation and implementing regulations provide for a wide range of flexibility for carrying out this goal. The manner in which grantees introduce English and prepare children for elementary school is left to the discretion of

EXHIBIT I

Comparison of Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start, and Even Start

Feature	Special Populations Preschool Program	Head Start	Even Start
Authorizing Legislation	Education Amendments of 1984	Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Title II-A	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvements Amendments of 1988
Goals	Facilitate LEP children's transition into the English-speaking environment of elementary school	To provide educational, medical, dental, nutritional and mental health services for low-income preschool children and social services for their families, and to involve parents more in their children's development	To improve the education opportunities of children and adults by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program
Planning Cycle	Initial proposal and second and third year brief continuation proposals	Annual requests for funding	Initial proposal and annual request for refunding which describes program goals, activities, and population served
Grantees	Local education agencies, private non-profit agencies, institutions of higher education	Local public or private nonprofit agencies	Local education agencies or consortia, states
Matching Requirements	None	20% of the costs must be contributed by the community in cash or services	Local programs must match 10% in the first year and an additional 10% each year to a maximum of 40%
Program Expenditures FY 1990	$2,197,064	$1,552,000,000	$24,000,000
Average Cost Per Child	$1,875	$2,869	Not available

EXHIBIT I (Cont'd.)

Comparison of Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start, and Even Start

Feature	Special Populations Preschool Program	Head Start	Even Start
Target Population	Preschool LEP children. Preschool is defined from the period of birth to the age of compulsory school attendance	Low-income preschool children from age 3 to compulsory school attendance. Enrollment opportunities for Indian and migrant children. At least 10% filled by children with disabilities. Parents of eligible children	Adults eligible for Adult Education Act services and their children ages 0 to 7 inclusive
Coordination Requirements	Secretary reviews applications for strategies to coordinate with elementary school programs for LEP children	Grantees must coordinate with schools, state IV-A agencies and other programs serving children and families	Grantee must implement coordination/collaboration with secondary schools, higher education, JTPA, Adult Education Program, Head Start, etc.
Activities/Services	Only educational instruction mandated by program. Projects generally offer services beyond education and may include transportation, free or reduced breakfast/lunch programs, counseling and health screening	Educational, nutritional, medical, dental, and mental health services for children, and social services for families	Core services: adult basic education, parent-child activities, parent education/child development services, early childhood services; Support services: transportation, custodial child care, health care, etc., Special events
Parent Involvement	Not mandated by the program though a goal in most projects	Regulations detail role parents play in decision-making and in participation as paid employees, volunteers or observers	Target population in legislation
Evaluation Requirements	Grantee designs evaluation and hires own evaluator. Conducts evaluation annually. Report submitted to project officer	Legislation requires independent evaluation to measure impact of program to determine its effectiveness in achieving program goals, its impact on related programs, and the structure and mechanisms for delivery of services. Use of control groups, where feasible. National report to Congress	Legislation requires independent evaluation that is national in scope, use of control groups where feasible. National report to Congress

the grantee but generally depends on such variables as the characteristics of the LEP population, the philosophy of the program, and the availability of qualified staff. The one basic tenet of philosophy that does permeate most approaches is that learning English should occur in an atmosphere of support for the culture and language background of the child.

Head Start and Even Start have a different focus, although their end goal is the same. Head Start is a more encompassing program than the Special Populations Preschool Program. Its goal goes beyond education to provide a wide range of developmental services--educational, social, nutritional, medical and dental--to bridge the gap in early childhood development between economically disadvantaged preschool children and their more advantaged peers so that they may begin their formal education on a more equal basis. Through educational experiences, the goal is to help children develop socially, intellectually, physically, and emotionally and become socially competent in dealing with the world. In addition, because of the recognition that parents play an important role in the process of a child's development, the program's goal is to involve parents in both the development and operation of the program and support their role as the primary educator of the child.

Even Start adds another dimension in assisting children to reach their full potential as learners by combining adult basic education programs with parent and early childhood education programs. The Even Start Family Literacy Program was enacted to "improve the educational opportunities of the Nation's children and adults by integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program". To accomplish this objective the goals of the program include helping parents become full partners in the education of their children and providing literacy training for parents.

It is important to note that while the Special Populations legislation is silent on parent involvement as a program component, a goal of many projects is to encourage parents to be an integral part of the bilingual preschool program.

Target Populations

Preschool Children

The Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start, and Even Start have some degree of overlap in their preschool target populations. Each program serves the same basic age group and each serves low-income and LEP children.

The Special Populations Preschool Program, which relies on the preschool definition in EDGAR (77-1) defines preschool as the educational level from birth to the age of compulsory school attendance. This accounts for the fact that the age of the program participants varies from two years to five years, with some five-year-olds in kindergarten classes. Head Start is primarily targeted to low-income preschool children between the ages of three and five. Children eligible for Even Start range from birth to seven years of age.

Although there is no requirement in the Special Populations Preschool Program, as in Head Start, that participants meet a specified income criterion, the vast majority of preschoolers participating in the Special Populations Program come from low-income families. Most participants in Special Populations are eligible for the free or reduced school breakfast and/or lunch program. Similarly, in Even Start, slightly more than one-third of the families served in the first year of program operation had annual incomes under $5,000. More than two-thirds of the families had annual incomes under $10,000.

Each program also serves LEP children, but the focus on LEP children varies with the program. LEP children are the primary target of the Special Populations Preschool Program. The regulations require that applicants seeking funding under the program be able to identify the

LEP children eligible to participate and differentiate between those problems related to limited English proficiency and those related to a child's disabilities. The legislation does not prescribe any methods for the identification. Special Populations Preschool Projects serve LEP migrant and Indian children.

Head Start and Even Start also serve LEP children. There is a set aside for Head Start programs serving Indian and migrant children. Data from Head Start indicates that about 20 percent of the Head Start enrollees are reported by their parents to speak another language (besides English) at home. The Even Start legislation also has a set aside for migrant children. In addition, the legislation targets LEP children by requiring that applicants seeking funding under the legislation describe the methods used to ensure that their programs will serve eligible participants most in need of services, and provide services to special populations such as LEP and individuals with disabilities. According to program data for October 1989- June 1990 approximately 16 percent of the preschool participants, ages one through seven, have a primary language other than English.[3] Evaluators believe that this is an undercount because it was the first year of the program; projects started late and were not filled to capacity.

Parents

The legislation enacting the Special Populations Preschool Program, unlike Head Start and Even Start, does not specifically require parental involvement. In Even Start, parents are a direct recipient of services. Even Start is designed to help parents become full partners in the education of their children and to provide literacy training for adults. In Head Start, parent involvement is a primary component of the program. The program stresses parent participation and involvement in both the development and operation of the programs. Regulations detail the role parents are to play in making decisions about the nature and operation of the program and in participating in the classroom as paid employees, volunteers, or observers. Local program advisory committees at the grantee and delegate agency levels must be composed of specified proportions of elected parents of current Head Start enrollees and representatives of the community.

---

[3] St. Pierre, Robert; Swartz, Janet; Gamse, Beth; Nickse, Ruth; Murray, Stephen; and Langhorst, Beth. "National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program, First Year Report: Status of Even Start Projects During the 1989-1990 Program Year." Draft Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, July 1991.

While there are no mandatory requirements regarding parental involvement, most Special Populations Preschool Projects have adopted the tenet that parents are the most critical educators of their children and should be an integral part of a bilingual preschool program. The manner in which parents are encouraged to become involved is at the discretion of the grantee. Individual projects tend to set varying goals for parents including involving parents in the child's learning and development, enhancing parenting skills, and improving parents' English language skills. Parent involvement in the Special Populations Program generally takes the form of volunteer activities, parent training, parent advisory councils, and parent-teacher conferences.

Coordination Requirements

A review of the coordination requirements provided in the legislation of the three programs was conducted for two reasons: the target populations of the three programs have some degree of overlap, and noninstructional services are provided by all programs. The review indicated that agencies funded under the Special Populations Programs have a much more limited coordination requirement than the Head Start and Even Start Programs. Whereas both Head Start and Even Start are required to coordinate with agencies that provide a range of services to program participants, this is not the case with the Special Populations Programs.

Head Start grantees are required to coordinate their services with schools, State IV-A agencies, and other community programs serving children and families. Since Head Start provides a range of developmental services, programs rely on other established programs in their communities to provide some of these services. For example, meals for Head Start children are provided through the Child and Adult Care Food Program administered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and medical and dental screenings and exams are paid for through Medicaid for all eligible children. Head Start grantee and delegate agencies must establish procedures to seek reimbursements from other agencies for services provided to Head Start participants; Head Start is to be the payer of last resort.

Similarly, in Even Start, applicants seeking Federal funding must demonstrate how they will cooperate and coordinate services between a variety of relevant service providers in all phases of the program. Even Start applicants must describe the methods by which they will coordinate with other agencies, in this case including secondary schools, institutions of higher education, the Adult Education Act, the Job Training Partnership Act, and with Head Start programs, volunteer literacy programs, and other relevant programs. There is such a strong emphasis on coordination that an integral part of the overall evaluation of Even Start is the examination of the types of collaboration that exist between Even Start and other agencies, the mechanisms used to enhance the cooperation/collaboration, and the services provided by the collaborating agencies.

In contrast, the only regulatory requirements for coordination in the Special Populations Program is between school-sponsored programs and the elementary schools serving LEP children in the local school district. No mention is made for coordination with agencies outside the school system. In addition, there is no requirement for nonprofit organizations to coordinate or collaborate with schools or other agencies.

Program Services and Activities

The Special Populations Preschool Program is similar to Head Start and Even Start in that grantees are required to provide educational services for the preschool population. However, educational services are the only mandated requirement of the Special Populations Preschool Program, while in Head Start and Even Start education is one of several mandated program components. The Special Populations Preschool Program regulations require applicants to show the extent to which their educational activities will meet the specific needs of LEP preschoolers and enable them to achieve the goals of the project, especially the goal of achieving English language proficiency as soon as possible. Other services are provided at the discretion of individual projects. In practice, most Special Populations Preschool Projects offer services beyond educational instruction (i.e., transportation, breakfast/lunch, counseling, and health screenings). These services are generally offered through the local school district or community agency in which the project is housed.

In contrast, Head Start and Even Start are required to provide comprehensive services to young children and their families. Head Start's Performance Standards, approved in 1975, require that all grantees provide services in four component areas: education, health/mental health/nutrition (including services to children with disabilities), social services, and parent involvement. In general, Head Start is required to provide an educational environment and experiences in which children can develop socially, intellectually, physically, and emotionally. The health component requires that all Head Start children be screened for medical and dental problems, that any identified problem receive appropriate treatment, that all children be up-to-date in their immunizations, and that each family be linked to an ongoing health services system that can ensure continuing health care. Health activities are integrated into the education curriculum helping children understand what is involved in health care exams and treatment. Within the social services component are requirements for maintaining an outreach and recruitment process to ensure enrollment of eligible families, assessing family needs, referring families to appropriate community agencies for services and advocating for families having difficulty obtaining services. Head Start also has a parent involvement component in which parents are involved in program planning and decision making, participate in classroom and program activities with their children, and help plan and operate parent education sessions where groups of parents can discuss parenting issues or listen to speakers.

Even Start, like Head Start, also goes beyond the provision of educational services. The legislation and regulations describe a broad range of services that can be grouped into three areas: core services, support services, and special one-time events. Taken together, these services include a health component, parent component, and various social service activities for the family. There are four core services.

- Adult basic education: regularly scheduled core programming for adults that includes Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, English as a Second Language, and General Education Diploma preparation, designed to improve basic educational skills, particularly literacy skills;
- Parent-child activities: regularly scheduled core programming, preferable in the home, for adults and children together, such as reading together, language activities, and instructional games;
- Parent education/child development services: regularly scheduled core programming for adults designed to enhance parent-child relationships and help parents understand and support their children's growth and development; and
- Early childhood education services: regularly scheduled core programming for children alone, designed to enhance development and prepare children for success in school.

A range of support services are provided, some of which are designed to facilitate the provision of core services. Examples include transportation, custodial child care, health care, meals, nutrition assistance, mental health referral, referrals for employment, advocacy assistance with governmental agencies, counseling, child protective services, referrals for screening or treatment for chemical dependency, referrals for services to battered women, special care for a disabled member, or translators.

Special events offered by projects include one-time events such as a pot-luck supper, or occasional activities or demonstrations on subjects of interest to the participating families.

Program Cost

To obtain an understanding of program costs associated with the Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start, and Even Start, our objective was to obtain comparable information about per pupil expenditures under each of these programs. Given the data that were available, however, we did not fully meet this objective. We were only able to obtain budget figures for the Special Populations Preschool Program and appropriations for the Even Start and Head Start Programs. We are unable to calculate the per pupil cost of the Even Start Program for several reasons. First, the Even Start appropriations for FY 1990, $24,000,000 included the cost of the adult education component as well as the early childhood component. Second, Even Start evaluators are reluctant to release enrollment figures. The Even Start evaluation has not yet been released and, since several projects started late, the evaluators are concerned that the numbers will not be representative of the program's expected enrollment.

The data available from the Special Populations Preschool Program and Head Start show that the average per pupil cost of the Head Start Program ($2,869) is approximately $1,000 more than the average per pupil cost of the Special Populations Preschool Program ($1,875). The calculations for the Special Populations Preschool Program were based on the following information. In FY 1990, $2,197,064 was budgeted by second- and third-year projects funded under the Special Populations Preschool Program. Individual projects received grants ranging from $57,919 to $304,421, with the average grant to the 15 second- and third-year projects at $146,471. A total of 1172 children were served by these projects, with individual projects serving between 25 and 363 children. The proposed budget amounts per child of operating the programs ranged from $619 to $8,481, with an average per pupil budget of $1,875. Our review found that where budgets per child were below $2,000, the Special Populations Preschool grant paid for the costs of services that supplemented the preschool project. Among those projects with budgets above $200,000, the Special Populations Preschool grant was supporting a full preschool program.

The Head Start appropriations for FY 1990 were $1,552,000,000. The per pupil cost was based on the appropriated figures. This program equates expenditures with appropriations because all appropriated funds are awarded in grants, and therefore it is assumed the money is spent. Based on the number of participants in FY 1990--540,930 children--the Head Start per child cost averaged $2,869.

The difference of about $1,000 in the average costs of the Special Populations Preschool Program and Head Start appear to reflect appropriately the differences in program services. The Special Populations Projects often supplement existing programs; Head Start projects fund a preschool program with a range of services beyond education in the classroom.

Evaluation Requirements

Each of the three programs has an evaluation component to determine how effective the program is in achieving its stated goals. The requirements for each program, however, are different in regard to the scope of the evaluation, the nature of the evaluator, the use of control groups, and the requirement to submit a report to Congress at the end of a specified period of time. Unlike the Special Populations Preschool Program, Head Start and Even Start require a national evaluation conducted by individuals who are not directly involved in the administration of the program or project operation. Extensive guidelines for conducting the evaluation are provided by each program. These evaluations are supported through DHHS and ED contracts respectively. The Head Start Program evaluations are carried out through a series of national evaluations concerning special initiatives (e.g., the Comprehensive Child Development Program), components of programs (e.g., the health component), and studies of subgroups offering innovative programs (e.g., Head Start in family child care homes), depending on the determination by the Head Start national staff. Even Start has an annual evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program in providing:

- Services to special populations (including LEP and disabled individuals),
- Adult education services,
- Parent training, home-based programs involving parents and children, coordination with related programs, and
- Training of related personnel in appropriate skill areas.

The Special Populations Preschool Program evaluations, in contrast, are individual evaluations, conducted annually, in which each program is required by the regulations to design its own evaluation plan and choose its own evaluator. Since the specific elements of the evaluation plan are left to the discretion of the individual grantee, the goals and the evaluation criteria for meeting those goals differ among the individual programs.

Another difference between the Special Populations Preschool Program and Head Start and Even Start is that the latter two programs require that the evaluation include control groups where appropriate. In addition, where feasible, in both Head Start and Even Start the views of program participants are to be included in the evaluation.

The audience for the evaluation reports also differs. Both Head Start and Even Start require that a national report must be submitted to Congress describing the status of the participants and the services provided. Under Head Start a report must be submitted to Congress at least once every two years describing the program's finances, distribution of services, level and nature of participation of parents, staff, and participating children. Even Start requires that a report be submitted to Congress by September 30, 1993 and to the National Diffusion Network for consideration for possible dissemination. The Special Populations Program requires that at the end of the year evaluations be submitted to the project officer. In addition, information regarding the Special Populations Program is included in the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation report submitted to Congress.